

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF THE
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
OCTOBER, 1875.

ARTICLE I.

THE RELATION AND DUTIES OF EDUCATORS TO CRIME.*

J. B. BITTINGER, D. D., Sewickley, Pa.

It is hardly too much to say, that the American people have been in danger of falling into the error of believing that knowledge is virtue—that to do better, it is only necessary to know better, and that intellectual culture is the panacea for moral, social and political ills. The general establishment of the common school system was both the effect and the cause of this sentiment. Of late, there has been some reaction against this one-sided view of the human problem of reform and progress.

In the quickened interest in all social questions, together with the increased study of statistics, and their application to the solution of the various questions of sociology, Education as related to crime has not escaped the student of science, and especially of those, who have been interested and engaged in penal reform. It has been clearly shown that ignorance and crime live in close and sympathetic relations. Criminal statistics have proved that, in proportion to their numbers, there are more criminals among the ignorant than among the

*Read before the Nat. Ed. Association, Minneapolis, Aug. 3, 1875.

educated. Ignorance exposes to crime by diminishing men's self-respect; by limiting men's opportunities and means of livelihood; by restricting the range of pleasure and safe pastime; and by exposing men to the full play of their animal passions.

But, while all this is true, and a more extended study serves to deepen the conviction that ignorance is the most fruitful source of crime, it still remains true that ignorance is not the only source of crime. A deeper study of criminal statistics, and a more careful classification of criminals, has brought to light the fact that there are educated criminals, as well as uneducated criminals. Forgery, counterfeiting, embezzlement of funds, perversions of trust, and also adulterations of food and drinks are not the crimes of ignorance, but rather of knowledge. The same must be admitted of bribery, tampering with the ballot, whether by fraudulent naturalization papers, by colonizing voters, or by stuffing the ballot-box. There may be many ignorant dupes in all these organized and wide-reaching villainies, but the leaders are neither ignorant nor duped. The man who plans a scheme of counterfeiting is never an *ignoramus* whatever may be true of the shover of "the queer,"—he has both capital and knowledge. In general, it may be said that between the two great classes of crimes—crimes of passion, and crimes of reflection, that crimes of reflection are committed by the intelligent rather than by the ignorant. Animal passions are less active among them, but the higher passions of the mind—covetousness, ambition, the desire to live extravagantly, and to keep up appearance and show, are passions which rage among the cultivated rather than among the uncultivated; and the crimes to which they lead are not petty larceny and sneak-thieving, but peculation, political jobbery and ring-frauds. The crimes with which the names of Swartwont and Price, Schuyler and Breslin and Tweed stand connected, are not crimes of ignorance, but of knowledge; not crimes of animal passion, but of social, political and intellectual passion.

Education lifts men above the crimes that come from those passions. Education lifts men into a higher plane of action,

and so exposes them to the crimes that lie in that higher sphere. An ignorant man will steal your coat, or pick your pocket; your educated rogue will work shoddy and devil's dust into the coats of whole armies and pick the nation's pocket. Education does not diminish the force of ambition, it rather strengthens it. Education will abate thieving, drunkenness, licentiousness, dog-fighting, &c., it will not directly diminish forgery, counterfeiting and kindred crimes of intelligence—save as it diminishes the field of the sharper's operations. Dupes will diminish and so there will be fewer dupers.

Nor should it be overlooked that the crimes of intelligence are much wider in their pernicious reach than crimes of passion. The latter, except in the case of murder, spend themselves on the spot—then and there, as unexpectedly to the perpetrator as to the victim, not so the crime of reflection. It was conceived in cold blood. It organizes itself carefully and coolly, it executes itself deliberately and at long range. Who can trace the corrupted currency to its fountain head? Who can bring home to the criminal the cotton that has been wrought into his broadcloth? or the *terra alba* that has gone into his sugar? or the log-wood that blushes in his wine?

In the march of intelligence crime marches *pari passu*. There could be no pocket-picking in Sparta, nor in an age when there was no currency; nor burglary so long as men had no fixed habitations. Vulgar stealing, and false swearing were contemporaneous with only the ruder states of society, while the gigantic swindles of the stock exchanges of London, Paris, Vienna, Berlin and New York are as far beyond Greek rascality as the Greek drama is beyond the modern farce. Take the "Schuyler frauds" on the New York and New Haven Railroad. The "Credit Mobilier" scheme, the "Erie management," The Southern Improvement Co.'s movements, The New York, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh Rings, The Indian Ring, the Custom House rings, the silk and whiskey frauds, the New York canal contract ring, and the organizations of money schemes in oil, coal and gold—

not to mention lobbying—these are not the plots of ignorance and passion—some where in those huge schemes of fraud and oppression are hidden master-minds of intelligence and administrative ability. It could only be a thoroughly educated rascal, who could conceive the plot of “salting” a field with diamonds, in order to place its mining shares at an advantage. If the general influence of education is to diminish crime, and yet its exceptional influence is to enlarge the scope of a certain class of criminals, what under these circumstances, are our relations and duties as educators to crime?

First, We must acknowledge and teach that there are educated criminals. Men who use their intelligence as a power to do wrong; taking criminal advantage of this superiority of knowledge over ignorance.

Secondly, We must teach that this class of criminals is the principal perpetrator of crimes of reflection—crimes, as has already been shown, that are aimed at property rather than persons; crimes, moreover, which attack society in its organized well-fare—by debasing the currency, adulterating food, drink and clothing; manufacturing goods “short,” and selling them at standard weight and measure, and corrupting the channels of legislation, justice and politics.

Thirdly, It must be held to be the duty of educators to elevate the moral tone of their pupils by showing that many forms of fraud, which are not against the statute, and which lead to wealth, are more debasing and more injurious than crimes of a more disreputable character. This latter kind of education is carried on more by example than by formal precepts—the educator himself being the example. Next to parents, teachers stand in the closest and most influential relations to the young, and as their toils tend to take persons out of the ranks of illiteracy, and put them into the educated class, so the crimes with which they stand most closely connected, are the crimes of educated as opposed to uneducated criminals.

The great mass of our criminal population cannot read or write; but the forger can certainly write, the counterfeiter

has been to school. William Dodd was a scholar—a private tutor to Lord Chesterfield, and yet he was guilty of bribery, and hung for forgery. Prof. Webster of Boston was a scholar, and no doubt his chemical skill became a temptation to him, in his evil hour. Eugene Aram was both scholar and schoolmaster, and yet guilty of robbery and executed for murder. All these men passed under the hand of teachers, and breathed the air of the school-room.

It is a fair question to ask whether the atmosphere of the school-room is not sometimes tainted. With a view, perhaps, to disparage the moral influence of Sunday School instruction, there have, at different times, appeared in the papers items and paragraphs as to how many of the inmates of our penitentiaries and jails had, at one time or another, been connected with Sunday Schools. In a similar spirit of depreciation a traditional charge has lain against the character of "ministers' sons" and "deacons' daughters," and though this slur has been removed by carefully prepared statistics, as doubtless it could be in the case of Sunday School instruction, it nevertheless remains true that, even from a Sunday School, a boy might go to the gallows, or a girl to the brothel. Educators in Sunday Schools may carry on their professional work by immoral methods—raising missionary funds by appeals to vanity are immoral. Stimulating children's liberality by fairs, exhibitions and denominational rivalries are immoral. Handling any moral means below its moral level is immoral—so that studying the Bible may be a source of deterioration.

Now look into the week-day school. If the teacher is not truthful in his speech and conduct; if he is not fair in his discipline; if his marking shows a partiality; if he crams for an examination; or in whatever other way he wraps up falsehood in his work, his influence is immoral. Daily prayers and Bible readings will not counteract this poison of dishonesty. That school-room will be a seminary of vices. Consciously or unconsciously, evil principles will be nourished under that roof. The educator in this case sustains an indirect relation to the crime.

There may be, and ought to be exerted by educators a direct influence in the repression of crime. When Dr. Arnold said to his pupils that it was not necessary that he should have 400 boys at Rugby, but that it was necessary they should be gentlemen, he expressed the grand truth that a teacher should make his school a reformatory. The proper soil of crimes is a low moral tone in society, and when the teachers in our common and professional schools: our academies, colleges and seminaries, do not create and diffuse a healthy moral atmosphere, the seeds of crime will germinate despite the intellectual and aesthetic culture of the schools. Where the moral tone of society is low it is usually signalized by low tastes and cruel tastes. A very important work here remains for teachers to do in our primary schools. Especially are female teachers called on in these matters. Their gentler natures, and more refined sympathies fit them to counteract the rude, and often cruel instincts of boys. Let it be the special duty of the teachers in our primary schools to dissuade their pupils from robbing of birds' nests; indulging in teasing or torturing brute beasts; in taking pleasure in dog-fights or cock fighting. Let their better natures be stimulated by stories of the sagacity of animals, the fidelity of dogs, the usefulness and patience of horses and oxen, the skill, industry and tenderness of birds for their young. Children will not abuse what they admire, and there is so much that is admirable in the lower orders of animals. Let children be taught that tormenting birds, and beasts, and insects is not only low, and cruel, but wrong and sinful. These traits of mercy in children will abate many a cruel and criminal deed in after life.

In addition to these direct and indirect influences, which educators should exert against crime, the time has come when positive instruction in penology is practicable. Sociology is a recognized science, and crime in its causes and origin is one of the departments of sociology. The body politic is liable to diseases. Crime is such a disease, and in a republic it is an important part of every young man's education to know that criminals are an integral part of the population; and

that they demand wise treatment. What is needed here is knowledge. The knowledge of how men become criminals, how they should be treated, and what results may be looked for. There was a time when criminals were simply ignored by the community, till dragged into the light by the arm of justice—for a few days they occupied the court, then disappeared within prison walls to be forgotten by the outside world. No one stopped to inquire, or seemed to care, whence they came or whither they went. Were they born convicts? Were they made such by others? or did they make themselves criminals? Still less did the community ask, or believe that possibly these men might come out of jail better men. A penitentiary was not, as its name implied, purgatory, but perdition. Elizabeth Fry, Maconochie, Montesinos, and Obermeier have proved that there is use for this human refuse. Criminals can be reformed. Criminals have been reformed—from 50 to 75 per cent. of them. It has been demonstrated that the laws of justice, of industry and of kindness, when administered by men of faith, are as effective for reform inside of a prison as outside. Onesimus was converted in prison, so was the Philippian gaoler. Who can tell what converted jailors and their convicts might not teach us of the power of the gospel wisely applied.

It is the duty of educators to tell and teach their pupils these and similar things. Some children are born to crime—a hereditary taint has corrupted their blood; others have had crime thrust upon them by their surroundings. They are the children of criminals; brought up by, and among criminals; educated to crime under a discipline more severe than is used to educate most persons to virtue. There is the self-made criminal—the man who has achieved villainy and who prefers to maintain that character. These things must all be known and believed before it can be known how these different classes of wrong-doers should be treated. The prison is their common home, but of the inside of the prison what it is, and what it should be, few persons beside the prisoner, and the jailor know, or care. The prison is a part of the temple of Justice, and its atmosphere should be as pure as

the atmosphere of a court of justice. The jailor no less than the judge an apparitor of justice. And yet how differently the words "Ermine" and "Turnkey" affect us. Well does Chas. Dudley Warner say: "Criminals in this country used to be turned over to the care of men who often had more sympathy with the crime than with the criminal; or at least to those who were almost as coarse in feeling, and as brutal in speech as their charges. There have been some changes of late years in the case of criminals, but does public opinion yet everywhere demand that jailors and prison-keepers and executioners of the penal laws should be men of refinement, of high character, of any degree of culture? I do not know of any class more needing the best direct personal influence of the best civilization than the criminal. The problem of his proper treatment and reformation is one of the most pressing.

* * * I do not know what might not be done for the viciously inclined and the transgressors, if they could come under the influence of refined men and women. And yet you know that a boy or a girl may be arrested for crime, and pass from officer to keeper, and jailor to warden, and spend years in a career of vice and imprisonment, and never once see any man or woman, officially, who has tastes or sympathies or aspirations much above that vulgar level whence the criminals came." We get a thief to catch a thief, and then employ a rogue or a ruffian, or both, to take care of him. Is it a wonder the criminal does not reform—with such keepers? it would be a greater marvel if he did. It is the duty of educators to exhibit such things to their pupils, and to make them feel that criminals have rights, inalienable and indefeasible; that criminal legislation should recognize these rights; and that penal treatment is nothing less than offence itself, if it does not regulate itself by these principles.

It is only necessary, in conclusion, to add that the field of Penology is a wide field, and one that is worthy of the attention of the philanthropist, the legislator and the scholar. In the field of prevention and reformatory measures, Elizabeth Fry, John Pound, Wm. Nash, De Metz, Miss Carpenter and Emily Faithfull, have won names of high honor. As prison

keepers and reformers the names of Hill, Croften, Maconochie, Pillsbury, Brockway and Cordier, are known and honored everywhere. In the speculative departments of criminal jurisprudence, Bentham, Beccaria, Quatelet and Livingstone are immortal. Where John Howard has led no educator need be ashamed to follow—but a greater than Howard is here. Jesus of Nazareth who was anointed “to preach deliverance to the captives,” says to the righteous—“I was in prison and ye came unto me.”

ARTICLE II.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

HOLMAN LECTURE FOR 1875.*

By Rev. G. DIEHL, D. D.

The rule established by those who have preceded me on the Holman foundation of Augsburg Confession lectures, of taking the Articles of the Confession in the order in which they stand, presents to us the tenth Article for our subject this evening. It is understood, I believe, that these lectures are expected to be a true and faithful development of the doctrines taught in the Confessional writings of the Church.

AUGSBURG CONFESSION. ART. X.

“Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the (true) body “and blood of Christ are truly present (under the form of “bread and wine,) and are (there) communicated to those “that eat in the Lord's Supper (and received), and they dis- “approve those who teach otherwise, (wherefore also the op- “posite doctrine is rejected.”

This Article treats of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, so called because instituted at supper time, (1 Cor. 11 : 20). It is also called “the Lord's table” and “the cup of the Lord.”

*Tenth Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, on the Holman Foundation in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, delivered on Monday evening, June 21, 1875.

(1 Cor. 10 : 21). Other terms have been applied such as "Communion," a festival in common, taken probably from first Corinthians 10 : 16 : "Eucharist," a giving of thanks, because hymns and psalms were sung. By the Greeks it was called "Mysterion," sacrament ; by the Latins "Missa," (Mass,) and by the Reformers "The Sacrament of the Altar."

THE NEW TESTAMENT ACCOUNT.

The institution of this sacrament is recorded by Matthew (26 : 26—29) ; Mark (14 : 22—25) ; Luke (22 : 19—20) ; and the apostle Paul (1 Cor. 11 : 22—26). Paul's account differs very little from that of his companion, Luke.

Matthew's statement is this : "Now when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve" (to eat the Passover which had been prepared by his direction,) "and as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, take, eat ; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it ; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

That it was instituted in remembrance of Christ is recorded by Luke and Paul. John does not mention the institution of the holy sacrament, but he records minutely a discourse of the Saviour (John 6 : 51—59,) which, in the opinion of some interpreters, has some reference to one feature of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

Paul warns the Corinthians that they cannot partake of the Lord's table and at the same time eat of Pagan sacrifices, (1 Cor. 10 : 16—21,) because "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God." And in another part of the Epistle (11 : 27, 29), he tells them that "whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," and "eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

THE DOCTRINE TAUGHT.

What is the doctrine taught in this Tenth Article?

It is simply this: that the true body and blood of Christ are present in the holy supper and communicated to those who eat and drink therein.

There can be no misapprehension with regard to the view set forth in this brief Article, for the authors of the Confession have, in other writings, clearly and fully expressed their sentiments on the subject.

A GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

The article, then, teaches that the true body and blood of Christ are present in a supernatural way, under the forms of bread and wine, and are received by the communicant. By the true body is to be understood not the material body and blood;—not the earthly, or gross or carnal body;—not such material flesh and blood as ours;—not the material body and blood in the form and state in which Jesus wore his body on the earth before his crucifixion, but that which constitutes his body and blood since his descent into hell, his resurrection, and ascension to heaven,—his glorified human nature,—that body and blood which is spiritual and celestial.

This stands in opposition and contrast to the Romish theory of Transubstantiation, that the consecration of the elements by the priest changes them into the body and blood of Christ. This is rejected on the ground of reason and scripture. No change in the properties of the elements can be detected by the senses or by chemical analysis. And Paul calls it after consecration, "The bread which we break."

This doctrine is also opposed to the Zwinglian theory which makes the Eucharist merely commemorative, and the presence of Christ merely spiritual.

It is also opposed to the Calvinistic doctrine which, admitting that the believing communicant eats and drinks the true body and blood of Christ, yet contends that the participation is by faith of the body of Christ in heaven, the local presence being only at the right hand of God.

Distinct from all and each of these views, the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession teaches that the true body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament, and communicated

to those who eat and drink in the holy supper, whether they have penitence and faith, or are unbelieving and wicked—whether worthy or unworthy, the efficacy of the sacramental presence being objective and not depending on the spiritual state of the communicant; keeping in view always that the heavenly or true body and blood of Christ impart to the believing or worthy communicant spiritual life and salvation, while to the unbeliever or unworthy communicant they impart judgment and condemnation.

How can we reconcile the apparently conflicting statements of the absence of all material flesh and blood and yet the presence of the true body and blood of Christ? To comprehend this doctrine, several truths must be always viewed in connection with this subject.

It is held that in the incarnation of our Saviour the human and the divine natures were inseparably united. We can have no conception of a Saviour except as a divine human being,—“God manifest in the flesh,”—“the Word made flesh,”—not for a limited time, but for all time. This union of the two natures is perpetual and inseparable.

Again, we can have no conception of humanity separate from flesh and blood. Christ was crucified and buried. After his burial he descended into hell; then rose from the dead; then ascended into heaven. In these three acts, or stages of exaltation,—in one or in all of them (descent, resurrection and ascension,) his body underwent a change similar to that which ours shall undergo in the final resurrection, when Christ “shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body,” (Phil. 3: 21). And as our bodies shall be raised “in incorruption,”—“in glory,”—“in power,”—raised “a spiritual body,” 1 Cor. 15: 42—44,) Christ’s body, since the ascension, must be a spiritual and glorified body. His humanity is a glorified humanity. His true body and blood appertain to his glorified state.

By virtue of the perpetual and inseparable union of the divine and human natures in one person—the divine human Saviour—the God-man—wherever Christ appears to his people, he appears not as *God only*, but as the God-man—the

divine human Saviour. So that the body of Christ which has one mode of local presence at the right hand of God in heaven, has also another mode of presence elsewhere.

Also, by virtue of the inseparable union of the divine and the human, the body of Christ has other properties than those which will appertain to *our* glorified humanity.

Now the Saviour's promise, "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," (Mat. 18 : 20,) and the other promise, "lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," (Mat. 28 : 20,) imply the presence of his humanity as well as of his divinity, for the two natures are inseparable in his one person. The promise of the presence of the Saviour in all Christian assemblies met in his name, is the promise of the presence *not merely* of the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity; nor the presence merely of God the second person of the Trinity as separate from humanity; because in the Saviour there can be no such separation of the two natures. The presence of God out of Christ could be no comfort to sinful beings. God becomes to us a reconciled Father, a friendly God, only through Christ the divine human Saviour. All the consoling promises and assurances of the Gospel rest on the idea and truth of these two natures of our Redeemer in inseparable union. If the idea of humanity essential to his being a Saviour, could be separated from Christ, the second person in the Trinity would become merely God infinitely holy and just, and as such, a terror to all the human family in a sinful state.

But the Redeemer comes to his people as the God-man, with all the sympathies of his humanity as well as with all the power and glory of his divinity. Now as his humanity is not palpable to our senses, though really present where Christians have assembled in his name, so in the holy supper, his body, though really present, is not in the material form in which he appeared in the days of his flesh.

The Scripture argument in favor of this doctrine rests chiefly on two passages, viz., "this is my body," "this is my blood," (Mat. 26 : 26,) and "The cup of blessing which we

bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. 10 : 16). It is held by the authors of the Confession, that these words occurring in the institution of a sacrament must be taken in a literal and not in a figurative sense.

THE DOCTRINE STATED IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE CONFESSIONS.

A few passages from the Confessions will show the correctness of the above statement.

Luther's Small Catechism: "The sacrament of the altar is "the true body and blood of Jesus Christ under the bread "and wine given unto us Christians to eat and to drink as it "was instituted by Christ himself."

Luther's Large Catechism: "Here we shall learn first on "what the power and virtue of this sacrament depend ; "namely, that the principal thing is the word and order or "command of God ; for it was neither devised nor invented "by any man, but it was instituted by Christ himself with- "out the counsel or deliberation of any man."

"What then is the sacrament of the altar? It is the true "body and blood of Christ our Lord in and with bread and "wine comprehended through the words of Christ for us "Christians to eat and to drink. This sacrament is bread "and wine, but not mere bread and wine, such as is taken "to the table on other occasions ; but bread and wine com- "prehended in the word of God and connected with it. It "is the word that makes and distinguishes this sacrament, so "that it is not mere bread and wine, but is and is called the "body of Christ."

Apology: "The sacrament was instituted by Christ to con- "sole the consciences of alarmed persons, and to strengthen "their faith when they believe that the flesh of Christ was "given for the life of the world and that through this nour- "ishment we become united with Christ and have grace "and life."

Smalcald Articles: "Concerning the sacrament of the "altar we hold that with bread and wine in the Eucharist

“are the true body and blood of Christ, and are administered
“and received not only by pious persons but also by those
“who are not pious.”

Form of Concord, (Epitome): “We believe that in the holy
“sacrament of the Lord's Supper the body and blood of
“Christ are really and essentially present and with bread and
“wine really administered and received. Bread and wine do
“not signify the absent body of Christ, but through the
“agency of the sacramental union they are truly the body
“and blood of Christ.”

THE LUTHERAN VIEW DISTINCT FROM OTHERS.

The Lutheran doctrine of the real presence clearly stated in these passages from the Confessions is brought out in stronger and sharper outlines by defining the difference between the Lutheran and other theories on the subject. Notice how boldly it stands out in opposition to the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, which is strongly condemned and rejected in the Confessions.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION REJECTED.

Form of Concord, (Epitome): “We unanimously reject and
“condemn the papistical transubstantiation where it is taught
“that bread and wine in the holy sacrament of the Lord's
“Supper lose their substance and natural essence, and thus
“become annihilated; that is, that they are transmuted into
“the body of Christ, and that the external form alone remains.”

Form of Concord, (Declaration): “We reject and condemn
“as false and dangerous the error of papistical transubstantiation, by which is taught that the consecrated bread and
“wine in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper lose their
“substance and essence wholly and entirely, and are changed
“into the substance of the body and blood of Christ; so that
“only the mere form of bread and wine (*accidentia sine sub-*
“*jecto*) remains. And as they think, under the form of
“bread which however according to their opinion is no
“longer bread but has lost its natural essence, the body of

"Christ is present, even apart from the administration of the Supper, when the bread is enclosed in the Pyx, or carried about as a spectacle to be adored. For nothing can be a sacrament apart from the command of God and the ordained use for which it was instituted by the word of God."

ROMISH VIEW REJECTED ON TWO GROUNDS.

The Romish view here so strongly condemned is rejected on two grounds. That the consecration by the priest effects no change in the elements is evident. Tested by the senses—by sight, taste and touch, there is no change in their color, form or qualities. Tested by chemical analysis all the properties of bread and wine remain after as before consecration. The Romish error is therefore condemned by common sense and reason. In the mysteries of the Christian religion we are never required to reject or discredit the testimony of our senses *with regard to the properties of material substances*. The Romish theory is therefore utterly untenable.

It is also condemned by the inspired word of God. St. Paul asks (1 Cor. 10 : 16), "The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" The breaking of the bread is after the consecration. Paul calls it bread at the time of breaking. If the Romish theory were true, Paul would have said, "is not the body which we break?" But instead of that, he says, "is not *the bread* which we break?" He clearly calls it *bread, after consecration*.

This shows how little the doctrine of the Lutheran standards is understood by those who have said that these standards teach a doctrine nearly akin to that of the Papists.

DISTINCT FROM ZWINGLIAN AND CALVINISTIC VIEWS.

The doctrine set forth in the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession and developed in the Catechisms and the Form of Concord, stands out in bold distinction from the Zwinglian and Calvinistic views. The standards group these views together and call their advocates "sacramentarians."

REPUDIATION OF ZWINGLIAN AND CALVINISTIC OPINIONS.

Form of Concord: "We reject and condemn with our

“ hearts and lips, as false and erroneous, these opinions and
“ dogmas of the sacramentarians, namely :

1. “ That the words of the institution are not to be received
“ simply in their literal meaning as they read, concerning the
“ true essential presence of the body and blood of Christ in the
“ Lord's Supper, but through tropical and figurative significa-
“ tions they are to be explained in a different sense. And
“ here we reject all similar opinions of the sacramentarians,
“ and their self-contradictory definitions, no matter how mul-
“ tifarious and diverse they may be.

2. “ Again we reject the doctrine by which the oral par-
“ ticipation of the body and blood of Christ in the holy sup-
“ per is denied, and by which on the contrary it is taught
“ that in this supper the body of Christ is received only spir-
“ itually by faith ; so that in this holy supper we receive
“ with our lips nothing but mere bread and wine.

3 “ In like manner we reject the doctrine that bread and
“ wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper are nothing
“ more than signs or badges, (*Kennzeichen*,) by which Chris-
“ tians may be known to each other.

4. “ Also that they are only indications, similitudes and
“ representations of the far absent body of Christ, in such a
“ manner that even as bread and wine are the external food of
“ our bodies, so the absent body of Christ, with his merits, is
“ the spiritual food of our souls.

5. “ That they are nothing more than signs and memorials
“ of the absent body of Christ, through which as through an
“ external pledge, we are assured that faith which turns itself
“ away from the Lord's Supper and ascends above all heavens,
“ there indeed becomes a participant of the body and blood
“ of Christ as truly as we receive the external signs with our
“ lips.

6. “ That in the Holy Supper only the virtue, operation and
“ merit of the far absent body of Christ are administered
“ unto faith, so that in this manner we become partakers of
“ his absent body, and sacramental union is to be understood
“ in the manner stated, that is from the analogy of a sign
“ and the thing signified.

7. "That the body and blood of Christ are received only
"spiritually through faith.

8. "That Christ is so contained and circumscribed with
"his body in a certain place in heaven, that with it he neither
"can nor will be truly and essentially present with us in the
"holy supper which is celebrated here on earth according to
"the institution of Christ, but that he is far distant from it
"as heaven and earth are from each other.

9. "That Christ neither could nor would promise or effect
"the true essential presence of his body and blood in the holy
"supper, since the nature and properties of his assumed hu-
"man nature can neither bear nor admit of it."

These declarations are sufficient to show how completely every phase of distinctively Zwinglian and Calvinistic doctrine is rejected. Calvin held many tenets in common with Luther on the Lord's Supper. But every thing distinctly Calvinistic—Calvinistic in opposition to Lutheran—was abhorrent to the theologians of the Form of Concord. Hence they repudiate as false and dangerous such dogmas as that the words of Christ in the institution can be taken in a figurative sense. This would divest the sacrament, they held, of its essence. The words can be taken only in one sense, that is, the literal meaning. Starting out with this principle, they repudiated with strong feelings of aversion the error that the sacrament is merely commemorative; or that the bread and wine were only indications, similitudes and signs of the absent body of Christ; or that they were mere badges of recognition; or that Christ's presence was merely spiritual, whether in the sense of imparting the influences of the Holy Spirit or of a purely spiritual presence of Christ the second person in the Trinity, as separate from humanity, (which would involve the overthrow of the whole doctrine of the incarnation and that of the person of Christ); or that the one nature of Christ, the God-man, can have only a local presence in heaven; or that the believer in order to feed on Christ must ascend by faith into heaven and there partake of the body and blood of Christ; or that the body and blood of Christ can be understood only in the sense of the virtue,

power and efficacy of the atonement; or that the efficiency of Christ's word and power should be so circumscribed and limited that he could not by his word and Almighty power cause such a presence of his body and blood as his solemn language in the institution imply; or that the faith of the communicant should have more power than the word of Christ, as in the Calvinistic theory; or that the presence of Christ should be dependent on the spiritual state of the communicant, thus putting the whole sacramental efficacy at the mercy of man, instead of the power and word of Christ.

In Lutheran theology the Lord's Supper is regarded as a fundamental matter in the Christian system. It embodies the great central truths of Christianity. Being the last institution of the Redeemer, the last doctrine, the last command, on the eve of the great atoning sacrifice, there is concentrated into it, as the climax of his teaching and ordinances, the essence of the whole Christian system. This sacrament strikes its roots down into the Old Testament dispensation. As the earliest promises and predictions made to patriarchs and prophets pointed to Christ, and every sacrifice in their ceremonial worship ordained at Sinai pointed to him; as every high priest was a type and every deliverer of Israel a figure of Christ; as he was the prophet like unto Moses; the King of David's house, David's Lord as well as Son;—the righteous branch mentioned by Jeremiah; the good shepherd foreseen by Ezekiel, and the Messenger of the Covenant promised by Malachi, so he was also the Pascal Lamb whose blood shields from the destroyer.

The Passover of the Mosaic dispensation was the most striking type of this sacrament. It was an ordinance of God, instituted by the divine command, connected with the manifestation of God's power in the deliverance of his people. It was a transaction between God and the people. The salvation promised depended on the strict observance by the people of their part of the transaction. "They shall take them every man a lamb," (Ex. 12: 3). The lamb unblemished was slain. The blood was sprinkled upon the lintels and door-posts of the houses. The flesh of the lamb was

eaten. Thus the covenant was kept, and the angel passed by the sprinkled houses.

Christ is our Passover. He is frequently called a lamb: a lamb unblemished. Isaiah tells us, "the man of sorrows" "was led as a lamb to the slaughter," (53 : 3, 7). John says, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," (1 : 29). Peter says (1. 1. 12), "The blood of Christ as of a lamb." St. John (Rev. 5 : 12), "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain."

As the paschal lamb was typically unblemished, so Christ our Passover was really perfect: "holy, harmless, undefiled, made separate from sinners." "Ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," (1 Pet. 1 : 11). Like the paschal lamb, Christ also was slain, "The whole assembly shall kill it, (Ex. 12 : 6). Of Christ it is said "They killed the Lord Jesus," (1 Thes. 2 : 15). "In the midst of the throne stood the Lamb as it had been slain," (Rev. 5 : 6). "Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood," (Rev. 5 : 9).

As the passover was a typical sacrifice (Ex. 12 : 27), so Christ gave himself a sacrifice for us, "When he said sacrifice and offering and burnt offering and offering for sin thou wouldst not, then said he, Lo ! I come to do thy will O God ; he taketh away the first that he may establish the second, by which we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all," (Heb. 10 : 8—10. Quoting Ps. 40 : 6—8). "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God?" (Heb. 9 : 14).

To the completion of the paschal ordinance and covenant it was necessary that the lamb should be eaten. "They shall eat the flesh in the night," (Ex. 12 : 8). If an Israelite had merely killed the lamb and sprinkled the blood on the door-frame of the house, but refused to eat the flesh, would the ordinance have been fully observed? Would the transaction have been complete? Would the covenant have been kept? Would the angel of death have passed by the house of the

man who presumed to transgress in one essential part? By no means. Man has no right or authority to add to, or take from God's word and ordinance. So in the Lord's Supper there is a natural eating of the bread, and a supernatural eating of the body of Christ. "The bread that I give is my flesh which I give for the life of the world. Except ye shall eat the flesh of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh hath eternal life. He that eateth my flesh dwelleth in me. My flesh is meat indeed," (John 6 : 51—58). In the passover the people were commanded to eat the flesh of the lamb in a natural way. In the New Testament Church the people of Christ are to eat in a supernatural way the flesh of the Son of Man:—not the material, not the carnal, or gross or terrene, but the celestial, the spiritual body,—to eat not in a natural way, but in a supernatural.

The argument employed by the theologians of the Reformation in support of this literal construction of the language of Christ in the institution of the Eucharist is: *First*, It is the natural, proper, original signification of the word *is*. *Secondly*, Even if there are some instances in classic and sacred Greek in which the word is taken in the sense of signifying, it cannot be so understood in this connection. In the institution of the sacraments, they say, Christ employed language only in its literal and not in a figurative sense. It is therefore doing violence to all fair construction, to take the words of the institution of the holy supper in a tropical sense. This is the more apparent when we bear in mind that in the language spoken by Christ at the time there are more than thirty words to express the idea of signifying. If therefore Christ had intended to declare, "this signifies my body," it is inconceivable that he should not have selected a word about which there could be no question, and which could not possibly mislead any one. Tropes and figures of speech would be incongruous in the statement of a sacrament requiring plain language and when words expressing the idea directly are so numerous. Therefore, the words of Christ must be taken in their proper and best, or literal meaning as he utters them in the institution.

They also claim for their construction the reverence that is due to the power of God. They charge upon the opponents of this doctrine a want of regard for the power and word of God the mighty Saviour.

Luther's Large Catechism: "It is the word that makes and distinguishes this sacrament. For it is said (*accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*) the word coming to the natural element makes it a sacrament. This declaration of St. Augustine is so explicit that you can scarcely find one more excellent in his writings. If the word does not appropriate the element to the sacrament, it remains a mere element. Now, it is not the word and institution of a mere prince or emperor. As it is the word of the Supreme Majesty all creatures should prostrate themselves and exclaim; Yes, it is as he says: and we should accept it with all honor, fear and humility."

"If a hundred thousand devils together with all the fanatics should exclaim how can this be so? I still know that all these spirits and learned men in a mass are not as wise as the Divine Majesty."

"To these words of Christ we constantly adhere; and we shall see who may presume to overcome Christ, and make these words otherwise than he has declared them. If you separate the words from it, there is nothing but bread and wine. If the words remain with the elements, as they must to make a sacrament, agreeably to these words, the body and blood are there. As the mouth of Christ speaks and declares, so it is. He can neither lie nor deceive."

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

The doctrine of the Confessions with regard to the divine person of Christ throws very strong light on the Lutheran theory of the real presence in the sacrament. I will endeavor to state this doctrine and the argument for the sacramental presence drawn from it, in language almost identical with that of the Form of Concord, and largely taken from it. This standard says:

"We believe and teach that although the Son of God has

“been a distinct and entire divine person—the true, essential, perfect God with the Father and the Holy Ghost from eternity, he nevertheless when the time was fulfilled, assumed human nature also in unity of his person, not in such a manner as to become two persons or two Christs, but Jesus Christ now in one person, is at the same time true, eternal God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and true man born of the Virgin Mary.” “These two natures in the person of Christ are never separated nor commingled with each other, nor changed one into the other.” “Each nature retains its essential properties to all eternity; and that the essential properties of the one nature never become the essential properties of the other nature.”

“To be almighty, eternal, infinite, to be present everywhere at the same time, are the essential attributes of the divine nature which never become the essential attributes of the human nature.”

“To consist of flesh and blood, to be finite and circumscribed, to suffer, to die, to ascend, to descend, to move from place to place, to be pained with hunger, thirst, cold, heat and the like are attributes of the human nature.”

“Each nature does not subsist independently in Christ, since the incarnation, so as to constitute with each a separate person; but we conceive these natures so united as to constitute one person only, in which both the divine and the assumed human nature subsist at the same time, personally united. Not only the divine, but the assumed human nature belongs to the entire person of Christ since the incarnation. The person of the incarnate Son of God cannot be an entire person without his humanity any more than without his divinity.”

“The human nature of Christ not only retains its original, essential properties, but in consequence of the personal union with the Divinity, and by its subsequent exaltation, it has been elevated to the right hand of Power, Might and Majesty, above all that can be named, not only in this world but in the world to come.”

“But the Christian Church has ever maintained that the

“divine and human natures in the person of Christ are so united as to have a real communion with each other. Yet the natures are not commingled in one essence.”

“On account of this personal union (which without the real communion of the natures could not exist,) not the bare human nature, the attribute of which is to suffer and to die, suffered for the sins of the whole world, but the Son of God himself suffered truly, yet according to his human nature, as the Apostolic Symbol testifies, he died truly, although the divine nature can neither suffer nor die.”

“By virtue of this personal union and communion of the natures, Jesus the Son of Mary was not a *mere* man, but a man who is truly the Son of God the Most High. By virtue of this union and communion he also wrought all his miracles. Likewise in his death, when he died not simply as another man, but *with* and *in* his death, he conquered sin, death, satan, hell and eternal perdition, which the human nature could not have accomplished without a union with the divine nature.”

“And now since he has ascended above all heavens, he really fills all things, and rules and reigns not only as God, but also as man everywhere present, from sea to sea, to the ends of the earth; as St. Mark declares, after he was received into heaven and sat on the right hand of God, the Lord worked with the Apostles, confirming their word everywhere. These operations he accomplished not in a mode local and circumscribed, but in consequence of his omnipotence at the right hand of God, which is not a particular place, but the almighty power of God which fills heaven and earth.”

The Lutheran doctrine of the Person of Christ is in entire accord with the Christology settled by the Council of Chalcedon. Let the preceding statements be closely considered. Prior to the incarnation Christ was a distinct, entire divine person, the true essential perfect God, coequal with the Father and the Holy Ghost from eternity. Yet when he assumed human nature he became only one person, Jesus Christ the true eternal God, begotten of the Father from

eternity, and also true man born of the virgin Mary. There are two natures but only one person, one self-conscious being. The two natures are never separated and yet never commingled. Each nature retains its essential attributes which can never be transferred to the other nature. Yet each nature does not subsist independently of the other nature, but the two are in such union as to constitute one person, and both the divine and the human natures belong to the one person Christ. The human nature not only retains its original, essential properties, but in consequence of the personal union with the divinity is elevated to the right hand of Almighty power. In this union there must be a communion of the one nature with the other. So that whatever Christ does or suffers, he does or suffers as a theanthropic person, as Christ the divine-human being. Although God cannot suffer, the divine-human Christ suffers. We cannot say that the man separated from the divinity does it; nor that the divinity separated from the humanity. But Christ suffered, died, ascended. Christ rules his Church, fulfils his promises, is ever with his people. In Christ dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

As Leo says, "Two natures met together in one Redeemer, " and while the properties of each remained, so great a unity " was made of either substance that from the time the Word " was made flesh in the virgin's womb, we may neither think " of Him as God without this which is man, nor as man " without this which is God. Each nature certifies its own " reality under distinct actions, but neither disjoins itself " from connection with the other. Nothing is wanting from " either toward the other; there is entire littleness in majesty, " entire majesty in littleness; unity does not introduce confusion, nor does propriety divide unity. There is one thing " passable, another impassable, yet his is the contumely " whose is the glory. He is in infirmity who is in power; " the selfsame Person is both capable of death and conqueror " of death. God did then take on Him whole man and so " knit Himself into him and him into Himself in pity and

"in power that either nature was in the other, and neither
"in the other lost its own property."

In applying this doctrine of the Person of Christ to the Lord's Supper, the Form of Concord proceeds thus:

"From this communicated power, therefore, Christ by virtue of the words of his testament can be and is truly present with his body and blood in the Holy Sacrament of the Supper. In Jesus Christ the son of Mary the two natures are so united that in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, Col. 2 : 9."

"In executing his offices Christ acts and operates not with or through one nature, but in, with, according to, through both natures, or as the Council of Chalcedon says, one nature operates in communion with the other that which is the attribute of each one."

"The right hand of God is everywhere at which Christ according to his human nature is seated, in deed and in truth, and reigns present, and has in his hands and under his feet, all that is in heaven and on earth ; where no man nor angel but the Son of Mary alone is seated, hence he is able to perform that which we assert. The word of God is neither false nor fallacious. God knows and has within his power various ways in which he can at any time be present in a place, and not in one only which philosophers call local or circumscribed."

It is admitted in the Confessions that Christ ascended. The ascension was real. Christ's body really went to heaven. It has a local presence in heaven. Lutherans do not teach a local presence of Christ's body on earth. But they hold that in addition to the local presence of that body in heaven, it has a presence on earth which is not local. There is a presence of that body in the sacrament. They call it a sacramental presence. The doctrine with regard to Christ's person as taught in the Confessions would not necessarily prove a sacramental presence. The proof of that presence is found in the words of the Saviour and those of St. Paul. The doctrine of the Person of Christ only shows that the idea of a real sacramental presence does not conflict with any estab-

lished Bible truth, nor does it come in collision with reason. Reason and Scripture harmonize beautifully with the doctrine of the presence of Christ's body in the holy supper, when the whole subject is viewed in the light of the true doctrine of Christ's person. It is well to guard against analogies between ourselves and our Redeemer. Yet there is something analogous between man and Christ with regard to the union of two natures in One person. Dr. Shedd says, "The union of two natures in one self-conscious Ego may be illustrated by reference to man's personal constitution. An individual man is one person. But this one person consists of two natures,—a material nature and a mental nature. The personality, the self-consciousness is the resultant of the union of the two. Neither one of itself makes the person. Both body and soul are requisite in order to a complete individuality. The two natures do not make two individuals. The material nature taken by itself is not the man; and the mental part taken by itself is not the man. But only the union of the two is. Yet in this intimate union of two such diverse substances as matter and mind, body and soul, there is not the slightest alteration of the properties of each substance or nature. The body of a man is as truly and purely material as a piece of granite; and the immortal mind of a man is as truly and purely spiritual and immaterial as the Godhead itself. Neither the material part nor the mental part taken by itself and in separation, constitutes the personality; otherwise every human individual would be two persons in juxtaposition. There is therefore a material 'nature' but no material 'person'; and there is a mental 'nature,' but no mental 'person.' The person is the union of these two natures, and is not to be denominated either material or mental, but *human*. In like manner the person of Christ takes its denomination of *theanthropic*, or *divine-human* neither from the Divine nature alone, nor the human nature alone, but from the union of the two. One very important consequence of this is, that the properties of both natures may be attributed to the one person."

In a complex being, constituted of two parts, each part by virtue of the living union of the two acquires properties not possessed inherently in itself alone. Matter cannot suffer pain. Yet in the living union of the two constituent parts of man, we say the nerves suffer pain. It is the union of the material composing the nerves with the mind that gives matter the susceptibility to pain.

Why then should any one question the statement that the divine and human natures in the person of Christ are so united as to have a real communion with each other, and the body of Christ, although locally in heaven, can be also in another mode present in the Church on earth and in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper? If the union of matter with mind in man gives to matter certain properties which matter separate from mind does not possess, who shall dare to limit the communicating power of the union of Divinity with humanity in the person of Christ? Is not Christ Omnipotent? Can his words ever be fallacious? Shall we not take the language he employs on the most sacred of all occasions in its proper meaning, in its natural sense, especially when there is nothing in Scripture, nor in science, nor in reason that forbids a fair and natural construction of his words?

THE ZWINGLIAN THEORY UNSATISFACTORY.

A comparison of the Lutheran doctrine with the Zwinglian will show at the first glance the unsatisfactory character of the latter. To make the holy supper merely a commemorative act is to take from it its sacramental character. That Christ in his last words, in his last ordinance, in the very consummation of his glorious mediatorial work, in the very climax of redemption, when imparting the divinest consolation to his distressed followers and instituting a channel of the richest blessings for his people for all time, should give nothing more than a commemorative ceremony, such as exists among all nations, by two symbols to aid the mind in recalling an important event, making the holy supper in principle nothing more than a fourth of July celebration, is utterly inconceivable. It is the baldest rationalism, in the

face of plain words spoken by the Saviour, and by his inspired apostle.

THE CALVINISTIC THEORY UNSATISFACTORY.

The theory seems to be this: that Christ's body is in heaven only, and in no sense in the elements; that he can be apprehended by faith only. And yet that our communion with him by the power of the Holy Ghost involves a real participation—"not in his doctrine merely—not in his promises merely—not in the sensible manifestations of his love merely—not in his righteousness and merit merely—not in the gifts and endowments of the spirit merely; but in his own true substantial life itself; and this not as comprehended in his divine nature merely, but most immediately and peculiarly as embodied in his humanity itself, for us men and our salvation." NEVIN.

"Christ is the bread of life, by which believers are nourished to eternal salvation. I conceive that in the remarkable discourse in which Christ recommends us to feed upon his body he intended to teach us something more striking and sublime, (than merely believing in Christ); viz., that we are quickened by a real participation of him which he designates by the terms of eating and drinking. It is not seeing bread but eating it that administers nourishment to the body, so it is necessary for the soul to have a true and complete participation of Christ, that by his power it may be quickened into spiritual life." "It is no other eating than by faith." "Those whom I oppose, consider eating to be the same thing as believing, while I say that in believing we eat the flesh of Christ, because he is made ours actually by faith, and that this eating is the fruit and effect of faith. They consider the eating to be faith itself, while I consider it a consequence of faith." "In Christ was life, the source and fountain of all creaturely existence." "Now since that fountain of life has come to dwell in our flesh, it is open to our reach and free use. The very flesh, moreover, in which he dwells, is made to be vivified for us, that we may be nourished by it to immortality. 'The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world'

"In these words Christ teaches not simply that he is life as the everlasting Word descending to us from heaven, but that in thus descending he has diffused this virtue also into the flesh with which he clothed himself, in order that life might flow over to us continually." "We conclude that our souls are fed by the flesh and blood of Christ, just as our corporeal life is preserved and sustained by bread and wine. Our souls could not find their aliment in Christ unless Christ truly coalesce into one with us and support us through the use of his flesh and blood." "I do not make Christ an object simply of the understanding and imagination. For the promises present him to us not that we may rest in contemplation merely and naked notion, but that we may enjoy him in the way of real participation. And truly I see not how any one can have confidence that he has redemption and righteousness by the Cross of Christ, and life by his death, if he have not in the first place a true communion with Christ himself." "In the mystery of the supper, under the symbols of bread and wine, Christ is truly presented to us, and so his body and blood in which he fulfilled all obedience to procure our justification; in order that we may first coalesce with him in one body."

CALVIN.

"Such virtue as bread has in nourishing our bodies for the support of the present life, the same is in the body of the Lord for the spiritual nourishment of our souls; and as by wine the hearts of men are exhilarated, their strength refreshed, the whole man invigorated, so our souls receive like benefit from the Lord's blood." CALVIN. "The body of Christ is eaten inasmuch as it forms the spiritual aliment of the soul. We call it aliment in this sense because by the incomprehensible power of his spirit he inspires into us his own life, so that it becomes common to us with himself, in the same way precisely as the vital sap from the root of a tree diffuses itself into the branches, or as vigor flows from the head of the body into its several members."

"The character of Christ's flesh was changed indeed when it was received into celestial glory; whatever was terrene,

“mortal or perishable it now put off. Still however it must “be maintained that no other body can be vivified for us, or “may be counted meat indeed save that which was crucified “to atone for our sins. The same body then which the Son “of God once offered in sacrifice to the Father, he offers to “us daily in the supper, that it may be our spiritual aliment.”

These passages from Calvin's writing show clearly his opinion on a number of points. The citations are numerous and copious enough to set forth his views in a clear light. It will be seen that he adopted many Lutheran sentiments on the Lord's Supper. In many things he was in full accord with the Lutheran standards and the views of the early Church. He held that the believer feeds on the body and blood of Christ, and that eating his flesh and drinking his blood meant something more than merely believing. He held that in the holy supper the believer eats the body and drinks the blood of Christ. His language is often in harmony with that of Luther and the Lutheran standards. But there are points on which he deviated widely. His Christology was defective, a Lutheran would say. He held indeed with the Lutherans that the body on which the believer feeds, is the same body that was offered in sacrifice on the cross. Although everything mortal and terrene in Christ's body was put away when he ascended, yet his body since the ascension is the true body or the same body that was crucified. But instead of holding to the sound Lutheran doctrine with regard to the person of Christ, that by virtue of the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ and the communion of properties, in addition to the local presence of Christ's body in heaven, by his almighty power he can cause his body to be present elsewhere—in the Church on earth and in the sacrament of the Supper, Calvin was led into difficulty and confusion and a measure of self-contradiction by his theory that Christ's body could have no presence anywhere except its local presence in heaven. Hence while he retained the primitive Christian doctrine that the believer feeds on the body and blood of Christ, he was driven by his doctrine

of the limitation of the bodily presence to the right hand of God, to adopt unsatisfactory methods of reconciling this with his sound views as to feeding on the body of Christ in the Eucharist. His explanation is, that *by faith* the believer feeds on that body which remains in heaven. This involves an absurdity. The believing communicant in the Lord's Supper is not transported into heaven as Paul was once rapt into heaven. If he were so carried by a transport into the third heaven, he would be conscious of it as Paul was. How then can he by faith feed on food as far removed from him as heaven is from earth? Calvin himself says it is not by imagination or contemplation. How then can a believer sitting at the Lord's table in a church on earth feed on the substantial food of Christ's body and blood? Calvin felt the difficulty. And how does he attempt to get over it? I will quote his own words. "It may seem incredible indeed that "the flesh of Christ should reach us from such immense local "distance, as to become our food. But we must remember "how far the secret power of the Holy Spirit transcends all "our senses, and what folly it must ever be to think of reducing his immensity to our measures. Let faith embrace "then what the understanding cannot grasp, namely, that "the Spirit unites things which are locally separated. Now "this sacred communication of his flesh and blood, by which "Christ transfuses his life into us, just as if he penetrated "our bones and marrow, he testifies and seals also in the holy supper; not by the exhibition of a vain and empty sign, "but by putting forth there such an energy of his Spirit as "fulfils what he promises." Again he says: "The power of "the Spirit is sufficient to penetrate through all impediments "and to surmount all local distance."

Here it will be seen that to reconcile the two conflicting dogmas Calvin himself resorts to this solution, namely, attributing to the Holy Spirit a miraculous power. Therefore every instance of a believing communicant feeding on the body and blood of Christ in the holy supper involves the working of a miracle by the Holy Spirit. How much more natural and scriptural the Lutheran theory. How much

more it commends itself to our judgment. If the Holy Spirit be omnipotent, is not *Christ* omnipotent also? If the Holy Spirit have such an energy that he can fulfil all his promises, has not *Christ* energy to fulfil *his* promises? If the power of the third person in the Trinity is sufficient to penetrate through all impediments and to surmount all local distance, who shall dare to set limits to *Christ's* ability to do the same? Does not *Christ's* power also transcend our senses, and shall we think of reducing his immensity to our measures? Why then imagine that the Spirit by his almighty power should convey the body and blood of *Christ* from its local position in heaven to every believing communicant on earth, when according to a more scriptural Christology the body of *Christ*, by virtue of the union of the two natures in one person, and the almighty power of the divine-human Saviour, has a presence (not local) with his people when they receive the bread and the wine in the holy supper, as he says, "this is my body," "this is my blood?" If *Christ* by his own inherent power could raise himself from the dead, has he not power to fulfil his own words concerning his body and blood? Why then resort to the unnatural and self-contradictory theory that the third person in the Trinity should take a body which has only a local presence in one place and give it a diffused presence all over the sacramental Church? Over against this idea we offer the Lutheran doctrine as scriptural, self-consistent, harmonious, beautiful and commending itself to the judgment of every man who will look at the whole subject in its proper light.

HARMONIZES THE SCRIPTURES.

The Lutheran doctrine harmonizes and elucidates other passages of the Scriptures bearing upon the general subject. While it is conceded that the Saviour was not speaking of the sacrament of the holy supper in the discourse recorded in the sixth chapter of *John's* gospel, it can be satisfactorily explained only in the light of the Lutheran doctrine. "Ex-
Vol. V. No. 4.

"blood ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life. For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed," (John 6 : 53—65). How can a Zwinglian explain this passage without doing violence to all fair construction of language? He must wrest the words from their proper signification. But with the Augustana and the Form of Concord before us there is no difficulty—no obscurity in these declarations. The body which was broken, the blood which was shed, in the great atonement, no longer terrene, or material, but heavenly or glorified, imparting life and salvation to the believer, who participates in the holy supper. The Divine-human Saviour although in heaven, is with his people on earth and gives them this spiritual and divine food—his true body and blood, crucified and shed for our redemption but now glorified and celestial—the bread which comes from heaven.

This doctrine elucidates with equal beauty and felicity the words of Christ when he says, "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine; no more can ye except ye abide in me. I am the vine and ye are the branches. He that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit," (John 15 : 4, 5.) The most intimate union subsists between Christ and those that partake of his heavenly body and blood. They draw their spiritual life from him as the branches live by drawing a current of life-giving sap from the vine. The bread of life which comes from heaven sustains the life of the follower of Christ. Ebrard says: "The breaking of the bread serves to bring into view Christ's death; the eating of the broken bread is a symbol that this death is appropriated in the way of a living union with the Saviour himself. As however Christ, in giving the bread to eat and the wine to drink, declares them to be the pledge of the new covenant itself in his blood, it follows that the bread and wine are not simply symbols, but that they serve to place him who eats and drinks, in real communion with the atonement through his death. And since such a communion with Christ's death can have no place without a life-communion with

"Christ himself, or since, in other words, the new covenant holds in the form of a real inward and living fellowship only, it follows again that the Lord's supper involves for the worthy participant, a true, personal, central communion and union with Christ's actual life." The same may be said with regard to the elucidation of the Scriptures which represent Christ as the Head, and believers the members of a body.

CONSUBSTANTIATION.

The Lutheran Church has been constantly charged with holding the doctrine of consubstantiation. Among the more recent theologians of respectable standing, who have given forth this idea, Dr. Shedd in his "History of Christian Doctrine,"* says: "The Augsburg Confession in Art. X, teaches that 'the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to those who partake of the supper.' This doctrine of consubstantiation according to which there are two factors—viz., the material bread and wine, and the immaterial or spiritual body of Christ—united or consubstantiated in the consecrated sacramental symbols, does not differ in kind from the Papist doctrine of Transubstantiation, according to which there is indeed but one element in the consecrated symbol but that is the very body and blood of Christ into which the bread and wine have been transmuted." Many writers outside of the Lutheran Church, less intelligent than Dr. Shedd, are constantly repeating the same charge. In conversation with ministers of other denominations we are constantly told, "you Lutherans hold the doctrine of consubstantiation." It seems indeed to be almost a universal opinion among all other sects. This is certainly strange when we remember how uniformly the Lutheran Church has denied it and rejected the doctrine imputed to her. We can only account for the extent of the erroneous opinion by supposing a general ignorance of the idea attached to the word Consubstantiation. What do the Standards and the Theologians of the Church say on this

* Vol. II. page 451.

subject? The Form of Concord says, "We utterly reject
"and condemn the doctrine of a Capernaitish eating of the
"body of Christ, which after so many protestations on our
"part, is maliciously imputed to us; the manducation is not
"a thing of the senses or of reason, but supernatural, mys-
"terious and incomprehensible. The presence of Christ in
"the supper is not of a physical nature, nor earthly, nor Ca-
"pernaitish, and yet it is most true." The Wittenberg Con-
cord says, "We deny that the body and blood of Christ are
"locally included in the bread." Gerhard says, "We neither
"believe in Impanation, nor Consubstantiation, nor in any
"physical or local presence whatsoever. Nor do we believe
"in that consubstantiative presence which some define to be
"the inclusion of one substance in another. Far from us be
"that figment. The heavenly thing and the earthly thing,
"in the holy supper, in the physical and natural sense are
"not present with one another." Cotta says, "The word
"consubstantiation may be understood in different senses.
"Sometimes it denotes a local conjunction of two bodies,
"sometimes a commingling of them, as for example when it
"is alleged that the bread coalesces with the body, and the
"wine with the blood, into one substance. But in neither
"sense can that monstrous doctrine of consubstantiation be
"attributed to our church, since Lutherans do not believe
"either in that local conjunction of two bodies, nor in any
"commingling of bread and of Christ's body, of wine and
"of his blood." Reinhard says, "Our Church has never
"taught that the emblems become one substance with the
"body and blood of Jesus, an opinion commonly denomi-
"nated consubstantiation." Mosheim says, "Those err who
"say that we believe in Impanation. Nor are those more
"correct who charge us with believing Subpanation. Equally
"groundless is the charge of consubstantiation. All these
"opinions differ very far from the doctrine of our Church."

The reader will see how utterly Lutherans reject all ideas
of a commingling of one substance with another, or of the
local inclusion of the heavenly with the earthly, or of a local
conjunction of the two, and even of a local presence at all.

The use of the words in, with or under seems to have misled the masses into the opinion that the Church believes in impanation, and consubstantiation. But the Church rejects both doctrines. Holding that Christ's body is locally in heaven only, she must necessarily reject all local conjunction, or local inclusion or substantial mingling of that body with material elements. If it were always borne in mind that it is Christ's heavenly body that is present in the holy supper, no one could imagine a local conjunction.

THE ORAL RECEPTION.

It might be asked why has the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper not been more generally acceptable to persons outside of our communion? In addition to the fact that it has been so generally misunderstood, there has been a difficulty in the minds of many on account of the positive affirmation in one symbol of the oral reception of the true body and blood. The Form of Concord says, "We believe, teach "and confess that the body and blood of Christ are received "with the bread and wine, not only spiritually through faith, "but also orally with the lips, yet not in an ordinary, but in "a supernatural, heavenly manner, on account of the sacramental union." No doubt most minds find it difficult to discriminate between an oral and a material reception. If the reception be oral they fail to see how it can be supernatural. They may ask, do we receive with the mouth any food that is not material food? It must be admitted that there is some force in the objection. Men will insensibly and almost inevitably regard as material that which is received by the mouth, unless they bear in mind the preceding qualifying phrase. The oral reception has sometimes been a stumbling block even with members of the Lutheran Church. Some have even wished that all allusion to an oral reception could be eliminated from the statement of doctrines. It is not in the Augsburg Confession. But it is in the Form of Concord. I will not enter upon an inquiry into the logical deductions from the brief statements of the Augsburg Confession, whether the oral reception is or is not by implication

included in the brief words of the Tenth Article. Finding it so clearly laid down in the Form of Concord, that able and scientific development of the Lutheran system, we may as well examine carefully the doctrine of the oral reception.

Let the qualifying phrase be carefully noticed. "The body and blood of Christ are received with the bread and wine not only spiritually through faith, but also orally with the lips, *not in an ordinary but in a supernatural heavenly manner.*" The oral reception is not then an ordinary oral reception. It is an oral reception in a supernatural, heavenly manner. The qualifying phrase "supernatural heavenly manner," relieves the doctrine of all idea of materialism. The true view of the oral reception is simply this. The heavenly body and blood of Christ being in the sacrament in, with or under the bread and wine, not by local conjunction or commingling of substances, not in the way of a local presence, but merely by a sacramental union, during the whole sacramental transaction, which sacramental transaction requires not only the words of Christ and the consecration of the elements, but also the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine, while the bread and wine are received by the communicant orally in an ordinary way, the heavenly body and blood being there in the sacramental union, during the whole sacramental transaction, (which is not completed until the bread and wine have been orally received), the true or heavenly body and blood are also received, not in ordinary oral eating and drinking, but in a heavenly and supernatural manner. While therefore it is called an oral reception, it is in a supernatural and heavenly manner. After all, therefore, the ordinary oral eating and drinking is merely that of the bread and wine. The reception of the body and blood being something, not earthly or material, but heavenly, is in a supernatural and heavenly manner. In the act of the communicant's eating the bread and wine, he receives the heavenly food in a supernatural manner—the believing communicant to the confirmation of his faith and growth in grace, the unbelieving communicant to his condemnation.

Gerhard's statement of this point is, "The sacramental

"eating of the body of Christ is none other, than with the mouth to receive the Eucharistic bread, which is the communion of the body of Christ, (1 Cor. 10 : 16). This sacramental eating is said to be spiritual, because the body of Christ is not eaten naturally, and because the mode of eating, like the presence itself, is neither natural, carnal, physical nor local, but supernatural, divine, mystical and spiritual. * * * The word of God is the food of the soul, and is yet received by the bodily ear."

As the Augsburg Confession is the only distinctive symbol universally recognized in the Lutheran Church, and as the expression "with the mouth," or "oral reception" is not found in the Augustana, nor in Luther's Catechisms, nor in Melancthon's Apology, nor in any other symbol except the Form of Concord, a man can be a sound Lutheran without adopting or even defending this expression found only in the statement of the Theologians in the Form of Concord.

In this abstruse subject the General Synod has wisely allowed liberty of sentiment. It seems to me that many of our ministers have not elaborated their views into a well-defined conception of the whole subject. Most Lutherans in this country believe in the presence of the Saviour in the Eucharist. By this they do not simply mean the presence of the Holy Spirit, or the presence of Christ as a Divine being. They understand by it something different also from the presence of the Saviour promised to two or three met in his name for ordinary worship. Some speak of it as a *special presence*; some, as a *sacramental presence*. Many seem not to have read extensively or reflected deeply on the subject. Their want of a more thorough attention to it may arise from the abstruse and mystical character of the subject. It may arise from the difficulty of divesting their minds of the idea of materialism usually suggested by the words "body" and "blood." The tendency to associate materialism with these words has created in the minds of a portion of the laity a kind of aversion to the use of the terms in connection with a sacramental presence. To them it appears to be impossible to divest their minds of the impression that

"body" and "blood" must mean something material, carnal, earthly. This feeling has no doubt deterred some from the careful study of the theology of our Church on the subject of this sacrament.

In justice therefore to the Lutheran Church, her ministers should impress upon the minds of her people (and so far as opportunity offers on the minds of members of other churches,) the fact that the Lutheran Church in all lands and by all her writers rejects all idea of a presence that is material, or carnal, or earthly; and that no Lutheran ever did hold the doctrine of a local or material bodily presence. At the same time, emphasis and prominence should be given to the fact that while the Church in her standards and writings of many of her honored theologians, uses the words of Christ and Paul, yet by "body" and "blood" is meant something heavenly, something that has no local presence, is not locally included in the bread and wine, that does not mingle with the substance of the material elements;—that while the Church sometimes uses the words "*in, with and under,*" she rejects the doctrine of impanation, subpanation and consubstantiation.

It should also be remembered that all other Protestant standards of the large denominations, except the Zwinglians, use the terms "body" and "blood," in defining the sacramental presence. The Calvinistic standards and the distinguished Calvinistic theologians of the Reformation period employ the same terms the Lutherans use. Prejudices against the Lutheran doctrine vanish when the whole subject is contemplated in its spiritual character.

It must also be borne in mind that this subject is a great mystery. Many aspects of it we are not to attempt to grasp, much less to set aside by our own reason. Calvin says, "They are preposterous who allow in this matter nothing more than they have been able to reach with the measure of their understanding. When they deny that the flesh and blood of Christ are exhibited to us in the Holy Supper, *Define the mode, they say, or you will not convince us.* But as for myself I am filled with amazement at the greatness

"of the mystery. Nor am I ashamed, with Paul, to confess
"in admiration my own ignorance. For how much better
"is that, than to extenuate with my carnal sense what the
"apostle pronounces a high mystery!"

It is contended by our theologians that the Lutheran doctrine is much older than the Reformation;—that it was the doctrine of the primitive Church during the first four centuries. If this can be established beyond doubt, it must be taken as a high testimony in its favor. While the Christian fathers were not infallible, it is strong presumptive proof of the soundness of a doctrine, that the earliest Christian writers have presented it as the doctrine of the universal early Church from apostolic times. If the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist is given by all the early writers as the universal Church's doctrine, and no writer has alluded to any teacher who first taught it, it would seem probable that it was always held and taught from the days of the apostles down. On this subject the testimony of Dr. Pusey will be regarded as possessing great weight from his thorough knowledge and extensive research. He first testifies that the Romish view was not held in the early centuries, but that the true objective presence of the body and blood of Christ under the bread and wine was then the doctrine of the Church. He says, "I have gone through every writer who in his ex-
"tant works speaks of the holy Eucharist from the time
"when St. John the Evangelist was translated to his Lord,
"to the fourth General Council, (451). And all agree in one
"consentient exposition of our Lord's words, 'This is my
"body, this is my blood.' Whence this harmony but that
"one spirit attuned all these various minds in the one body
"into one: so that the very heretics were slow herein to
"depart from it. However different the occasion may be
"upon which the truth is spoken, in whatever variety of
"ways it may be mentioned, the truth itself is one and the
"same—one uniform, simple, consistent truth, that what is
"consecrated upon the altar for us to receive, what under
Vol. V. No. 4.

“the outward elements is there present for us to receive, is the body and blood of Christ.”

A distinguished Lutheran theologian of this country, says, “The Lutheran Church believes on the sure warrant of God’s word, that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ remains a true human body, and as to its natural and determinate presence has been removed from earth, and is in the glory of the world of angels and the redeemed. She also believes that in and through the divine nature with which it forms one person, it is present on earth in another sense no less true than the former. She believes that the sacramental elements are divinely appointed through the power of the Saviour’s own benediction as the medium through which we participate after a spiritual, supernatural, heavenly, substantial, objective and true manner ‘in the communion of his body and of his blood.’

“She believes that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ is really absent in one respect, and just as really present in another. * * * It is present without extension, for the divine through which it is present is unextended,—it is present without locality, for the divine through which it is present, is illocal. It is on earth, for the divine is on earth,—it is in heaven, for the divine remains in heaven, and like the divine it is present truly and substantially yet incomprehensibly.”*

* Conservative Reformation, 650, 651.

ARTICLE III.

CONSECRATION IN THE MINISTRY.*

By REV. D. STECK, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

In the good providence of God we greet each other, once more, in our annual meeting. On the part of those of us who, in other days, were familiar with these scenes, it is a time for congratulation. But the occasion possesses a value beyond that which is imparted to it by these attendant and appropriate formalities. To your speaker, and to others, it is an hour, which, by reason of the memories it awakens, touches and thrills the heart. It is now twenty-nine years, lacking a few weeks, when a class of twelve, embracing among others the name of him who addresses you, completed the Seminary course; and, honored with the credentials of its revered Faculty, went forth from its halls into the ranks of the ministry. Of that faculty, and the corresponding one of the College, there remains here to-day but a single representative. The missing faces and forms, with but one exception, have gone hence, some in a good old age, others in their prime, all in a state of readiness for the transition, in response to the summons which awaits the youngest of their successors, and the last of their pupils. We feel their presence still. It is well that we do. They were men of no common order. The pioneers, in a certain sense, of liberal and sacred learning in our American Church, they were eminently qualified for the high and responsible positions they filled. And who is prepared to furnish an adequate estimate of the beneficent results of their labors, or tell the extent of the intellectual and moral wealth which has flowed into the church in consequence of their united toil?

This allusion to departed worth will hardly be adjudged out of taste on such an occasion; and surely not in this place.

* An Address before the Alumni of the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., June 22, 1875.

When the boat plying the waters of the Potomac brings the passenger in sight of Mount Vernon, she orders her flag at half-mast; and convened where we now are, and for the purpose which has brought us together, we cannot withhold a passing tribute from those to whom we are so much obliged for the interests which centre here, or deny to honored names our grateful recognition.

The selection of a subject appropriate to the hour, and suitable to this grave presence, was a question about which we lingered for some time in doubt. Having little taste for the purely speculative, or theoretical, it appeared to us that the presentation of some practical subject wherein, with the divine blessing, we might find a stimulus to our too languid zeal in the prosecution of the Master's work, would meet the demands of the occasion to the best advantage. Among the various topics of this character which offered themselves, the one we have selected as the theme on which it is proposed to present such reflections as we have had time, amid other cares, to work out and arrange, is that of CONSECRATION TO OUR SACRED CALLING.

We begin with THE CALLING ITSELF. What is its nature and object? What is its character and purpose as determined by the word of God? These questions are not raised because there is any thing novel in them. They were old questions centuries before any of us were born. Nor are they put before you because the speaker is vain enough to think that any answer he could give, would afford new information in regard to these well-worn questions. Our motive is rather to be found in that weakness of our nature which makes it necessary that important truths, however well known, must, in order that they may continue to exert their just influence, often be restated. The doctrines, duties, and principles which are vital to the Christian system, have need to be presented again, and again. There must, in relation to these things, be "line upon line, precept upon precept." Nor, when thus faithful, need the servant of God be sensitive, though his fidelity should provoke men who have "itching ears" to say that his preaching has the sound of a "thrice-

told tale." Until men stop sinning, it will be necessary for the preacher, even at the risk of considerable reiteration, to say that they are sinners. And so in regard to the question in hand. While there is a ministry, the inquiry touching its origin and purpose cannot be out of place.

Ours is an office of divine appointment. It was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ. Its first incumbents were the twelve apostles, called and ordained by the immediate act of the Master himself. To these, in their ordinary character as ministers of the Gospel, others were to succeed until the dispensation inaugurated by him should usher in the final consummation. Christ our Lord created the office, calls the incumbents, and determines the work. Emanating from Christ in the first instance the office has the same origin still. Though the call and mode of investiture are no longer immediate but mediate, yet are they divine, as the office itself is divine. Ours, then, is a sacred trust. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ." What a thought!

And what is the purpose of this, our sacred calling? Or, was it not meant by him to whom we trace its origin to have any thing very explicit as its objective point? Was this a matter which might be referred in some measure to the option of the person called? Might he in any sense, so far as this point is concerned, regard himself as placed on the margin of a sea of speculation, to be allowed in his freedom to drive for any point he pleased? Were we obliged to find our answer in the use to which the pulpit has sometimes been put, we would be tempted to reply in the affirmative. But turning for our answer to the teaching of inspiration, we find nothing to warrant us in the adoption of a theory so latitudinarian as this.

"My kingdom is not of this world," said the son of God. And to the men whom he constituted the first heralds of his will, he gave the command: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." St. Paul declares that "when in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God

by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Without adding other citations of like import to be found in every part of the New Testament, these taken from that ultimate source of appeal, indicate with sufficient clearness the one grand aim and purpose of this divinely arranged agency. Its object is the salvation of the world from the curse and ruin which sin has entailed; and it knows no other. Not but that important collateral results, social, civil, moral, humanitarian, are to be, and will be, secured by it; but these are meant to be attained as consequent upon the attainment of the direct object, and not as in any sense constituting that object itself. The scope and aim of the office are wholly spiritual. It contemplates the race as at enmity with God, and it seeks by means of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, to bring about peace between man and his Maker. It regards the world of humanity as lost, and its object is, by means of the truth, to lift the race out of the ruin into which sin has plunged it. It looks upon the sinner as adrift upon the tide of spiritual death, and its purpose is, by means of the Gospel, to divert him to the shore, and snatch him from perdition.

This is the one direct end of our sacred calling; and in proportion as this is set aside, or obscured, by aught else that can be named, in that proportion is the ministry false to the design of its institution. Whether there is now, or has been in the recent past, on the part of many in the ranks of the clergy, a sufficiently clear apprehension of the true scope and aim of the pulpit, is a question which, perhaps, admits of some doubt, though it is one on which it is not proposed at this time to advance an opinion.

The required CONSECRATION. It is hardly needful to say that the term *consecration* is here used in the sense of devotion. We mean by it the thorough and complete surrender of the individual, by his own free act, superinduced by the constraining power of the truth and Spirit of God, to the promotion of the one divinely designated purpose which has just claimed our attention.

The duty of such entire consecration is obvious as the

mere dictate of common sense in connexion with the views which have already been advanced. As the office is of divine origination, and each one who holds it rightly, holds it in consequence of a divine call, surely nothing short of the best service of which the incumbent is capable, can be thought of, as meeting the necessities of the case. But appealing to the explicit teaching of the word of God, on this point, what do we learn? In order to accomplish such devotion in their own case, the apostles, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, instituted the diaconate, that they themselves might not be hindered in the prosecution of their direct object, even by attention to the necessary and sacred claims of the poor: "But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word." When our Lord would lay upon the conscience of a certain man the duty of going forth to herald his Messianic reign, he was met by this answer: "suffer me first to go and bury my father." And what was the Master's reply? "Let the dead bury their dead: but go thou and preach the kingdom of God." To the Corinthians, St. Paul says of himself: "I determined not to know any thing among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." And are we not to regard his avowal in this particular as involving the rule of inspiration for all ministers? To Timothy his direction is: "Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all." These inspired utterances need no comment. Their bearing upon the point under inquiry is too obvious to leave any room for doubt.

But here it is proper to observe, that such devotion, to be real and effective, must be associated inseparably with such energizing elements as these: There must be *true piety*. The man must have been born of the Spirit. The love of God must be shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost. Christ must be formed in him the hope of glory. Unquestionably God may honor his word, although proclaimed by unsanctified lips. Still, it is a truth which all experience attests, that they preach most effectually who preach from experience; who can say, and say it truly: "We know whom we

have believed." On the other hand, those who know him not experimentally, are obnoxious to the rebuke: "Who hath required this at your hand to tread my courts?" And the consciousness of their exposure, in this respect, must be a perpetual source of embarrassment, and for this reason, a cause of weakness and inefficiency.

There must be habitual *study*, the study of the best books, and especially that of God's inspired word. The Bible is the Book of books for all Christians, but pre-eminently for the ministers of God. What beauty, majesty, and power there is in its words! power to convict, and power to convert; power to sadden, and power to cheer; power to cast down, and power to raise up; power to wound, and power to heal; power to kill, and power to make alive! It is all this, and more than this, without any aid from man. That which is perfect admits of no improvement; and "the law of the Lord is perfect" The "sword of the Spirit," it is most effective as forged, and burnished, and sharpened by him whose it is, and by whom it is wielded. "The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of the soul and the spirit, of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

There must be *a heart which pulsates in deep sympathy* for man, in view of the miseries in which sin has involved him. This, in connexion with other requisites which need not be named, is an element of great value. A cold, unsympathetic, phlegmatic nature is surely quite foreign to the spirit of that Gospel which is itself but the expression of Jehovah's compassion for a lost and ruined world; and if it be not an absolute, it is yet a most serious hindrance to effective service in the ministry. A soul sympathetic as that of a child to the woes of humanity, was unquestionably one of the human elements of Paul's power. What a yearning of tenderness lay back of the words: "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved!" and what fellowship of suffering in these: "Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not?" In the like deep sympa-

thy lay one of the secrets of Whitefield's effectiveness, so that the touching pathos of his tones, conditioned as they were by the feelings of his heart, moved vast multitudes to tears.

Another requisite—the mention of which might be omitted, on the score of its triteness, but dare not be, on account of its importance—is *prayer*. This is the appointed condition on which alone the aid of the Holy Spirit, without whose help we are powerless, is secured. It was by prayer that the apostles kept their Pentecost, and obtained their baptism of fire. By it came the light which afforded them their first perfect apprehension of the true, spiritual nature of the Redeemer's kingdom; and by it they obtained power to preach as they were never able to preach before. By it they were lifted above the low, carnal plane on which they had hitherto moved. It surrounded them with a new atmosphere. It revealed to them a new world. Nor is it less a condition of effectiveness in others than it was in them. All ministers of great and permanent power have been noted as men of prayer. It was prayer that made "Luther's words half battles!" It was this that made queen Mary tremble at the mention of the name of John Knox, whose prayers she is said to have feared more than she would have feared an army with banners.

These conditions, and such as these, are supposed to be involved in that full surrender, that thorough self-consecration to which the work before considered, is entitled. They are assumed to be its inseparable concomitants. They make it a reality. They are the conditions and supports of its existence.

Some MOTIVES urging to such thorough self-consecration. Of these many might be named, but limited in time, we can mention only a few. And first, we would present *the moral grandeur of the end* contemplated by our sacred calling. What this is we have seen. It is the salvation of our brethren of mankind from the guilt, condemnation and misery of sin; and their elevation to moral excellence, purity, happiness, and life forevermore! It is for us, intent on the fulfil-

ment of our mission, to take the measurement of the woes which brought the Redeemer from his throne, and moved to compassion by the miseries we behold, as he was, to announce to our suffering fellow mortals the grand fact of their redemption, and aid them by our ministry to avail themselves of the glorious possibilities of blessedness which that redemption has placed within their reach. What a motive to rouse our enthusiasm, and free us from the lethargic bonds which hold our powers enchained! There are other callings which enlist and justify in their devotees, the best exertion they can render. Such are the medical profession, and that of the law, in which so much of the cultivated mind of the country finds, or seeks to find a field for employment. Far be it from me to speak of them in terms of disparagement. Rightly apprehended, and honorably pursued, they are noble callings, contemplating exalted moral ends. But these ends, respecting as they do, the welfare of men only in regard to the present life, are immeasurably surpassed in moral dignity by that of the ministry, seeing this latter contemplates the welfare of the race both for time and eternity. No wonder, as his great soul took hold of these far-reaching results of the work in which he was engaged, the apostle Paul magnified his office! And, under the inspiration of such a motive well does it become us to yield our undivided energies to the noblest calling to which men may aspire. We should feel under it as felt the prophet when, recovering from the depression to which the rejection of his testimony had exposed him, he exclaimed: "Then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name. But his word was in my heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay!"

Should we not find a stimulus to such consecration *in the devotedness of others?* Great is the power of example, and to it as a motive to faithfulness, the sacred writers often make their appeal. The eleventh chapter to the Hebrews is an illustration. Not to dwell upon the example of our Lord, as unapproachable by reason of his divinity, look at that of his illustrious servant, the apostle to the Gentiles. Prone

upon the ground where he lay at the moment of his marvelous arrest, he puts up his prayer to him who speaks from out the bright, burning glory overhead: "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" He gets his answer. And from that moment to the day of his death his devotion to the one thought of serving his Lord in the ministry, was so intense that it excluded every other purpose from his mind. That thought was his life, the world *in* which, and *for* which he lived. And hence that marvelous concentration of vast significance into one brief sentence: "To me, to live is Christ!" What an illustration, too, of the like unreserved consecration we have in that splendid avowal to his brethren of his readiness to "offer himself *upon* the sacrifice and service of their faith"—his disposition to supplement, so to speak, what was lacking in their devotion by the more earnest exertion on his part! Hear also that solemn protest of his purpose to glory in nothing but the cross of his divine Master! And was ever protestation exemplified by a career so replete with various and incessant toil? From city to city, from province to province, from land to land, in the true spirit of that avowal, he pursues his beneficent way, and to Jew and Gentile proclaims salvation by the cross. In the hut of the poor, and the mansion of the rich; in the hovel of the slave, and the palace of the prince; in the circle of the unlettered and the assembly of the learned; to those who were unknown, and those who were well known, the humblest and the highest, boors and philosophers, he unfolded the story of the cross, and proclaimed salvation by the Crucified. We might, but may not now, advert to other examples of eminent devotion to this holy work. Every age has furnished them, and our own time is not destitute of them. By the study of such examples our zeal will be quickened, and in the attainment of a fuller consecration, our ministry will be blessed with more abundant results.

We might enlarge upon this head, by dwelling upon the relationship of sympathy into which our work, prosecuted in this spirit, brings us to the whole benevolent universe, to good men, to angels, and the Triune God; we might expa-

tiate upon the consequences of unfaithfulness as realized in a barren ministry here, and an awful retribution hereafter; but with a bare allusion to these considerations, let me ask you to reflect upon the required consecration in connexion with *its assured reward*. "Great is your reward in heaven," was the language of our Lord to his disciples when urging them to the like fidelity. It were easy to speculate upon the probable nature of this reward, to venture our conjectures in regard to some of the elements of blessedness which will enter into it, and to understand why it is entitled to be called great, even among the great things which belong to that exalted state. While mingling with the host of the redeemed, basking as they do amid the glories of the high, eternal throne, there will be the consciousness that some, perhaps many of those who compose that innumerable company, owe their elevation to that felicitous state to our instrumentality while in the occupancy of this sacred trust. But all speculation aside. We have no disposition to appear "wise above what is written." It is enough that we can rest our faith, touching this point, on the explicit teaching of Christ, whose ability to take the measurement of the blessedness to which he refers, is beyond all question; and he declares: "your reward is great in heaven!"

By these considerations, and by others which the mention of these can hardly fail to suggest, we should feel ourselves moved as by a moral force not to be resisted without guilt, to devote every energy with which nature, education, or grace has endowed us to the promotion of that kingdom whose interests the Saviour has entrusted so largely to the care of his ministers.

And now, it seems to me, no more fitting conclusion can be made to these reflections, than may be supplied in a modest reference to our beloved "School of the Prophets," in view of what it has done, and is doing, for the Church and the world. At this time in the enjoyment of a measure of prosperity hitherto unknown in its history, may it hold, and ever continue to hold, a select place in the memory and heart of every Alumnus! Its instructors of to-day, not to say more,

in their presence, are men of God in whose ability and fitness every way to fill the respective positions assigned them, the Church has confidence, and who have proved their right to that confidence by the stern test of successful trial. To say that they are worthy to hold seats in the Faculty, once occupied by men whose names fill a large space in the history of our Church in this land, names which it were a sin against every instinct of gratitude not to enshrine in our heart of hearts, is to pay them a high, though nothing more than a merited compliment. Long may they live, and by their labors in the training of suitable candidates for the holy office, bless the Church whose servants they are. The Institution over which they preside, what an agency of untold blessing under God it has been to our Zion! We ignore not the existence and influence of other like institutions of our Church in this country. We thank God for these also. They have done, are doing, and will continue to do, a good work. We would not by act or word put the smallest hindrance in the way of their success. Rather do we bid them God-speed, and pray for their continued and more enlarged prosperity. But, while generous to others, we are not to be blamed for wishing to be just to ourselves. The first of its name to enlist in its behalf the concentrated and effective sympathy of any considerable portion of our Church in this western world, it presents in its catalogue the largest number of Alumni, and has been the most wide-spread in its influence. It has indeed, under Providence, been the parent of most of the others. It became thus the earliest prominent fact in the marked development of our Church in this land. As has been said, and not inaptly said of the "Old Dominion" among the States, that she has been "the mother of States, and of statesmen;" so can it be said of our own Seminary, especially in view of the allied influence of the College at her side: she has been the mother of seminaries and the educator of men to fill their chairs. We have Springfield, and Philadelphia, and Selinsgrove, and Salem; but Gettysburg was before any of them, and to Gettysburg they are largely indebted for their existence.

Truly from this educational centre have issued "streams which have made glad the city of God." Fifty years ago—lacking one—our Church, so far as her condition in this country was concerned, was still in the wilderness, pursuing her journey towards a prospective Canaan—not yet fully discovered, but seen by a Moses here and there from his own special Nebo—and the founding of our Seminary was to her what the stream which leaped hissing to the stroke of Moses' rod, was to the famishing tribes of Israel. For fifty years the stream of blessing has been flowing through the land, the current ever deepening, ever widening as the years have rolled on, and to-day the wilderness and solitary places are made glad by reason of its presence.

May her power for good, by the favor of Heaven and the efforts of her friends, be increased four-fold. May her sons now, and hereafter to issue from her walls, be men of God indeed, fearing no foe, shunning no toil, meeting all duties, braving all trials, intent upon a career of service in the cause of the blessed Master, which, while it will be honorable to themselves and creditable to the Institution, will result most beneficently to the world, the promotion of whose welfare supplies the highest motive. How vast is the field which invites their toil! It is as broad as our land, as vast as the world. May they be found preaching Jesus and the resurrection, as a few of our number are doing to-day, on the far off slopes of the Rocky Mountains; and thence moving on with the ever restless tide of our population as it climbs those rocky barriers, and laves the summits of those heaven-aspiring peaks, follow it in its downward sweep on the farther slope, to renew their testimony where it finds its limit on the coast of our great western sea. Let them heed the Macedonian cry which comes from distant India, where Schwartz and Heyer toiled, and where sleep in their long repose the ashes of Walter Gunn, whose face and form and earnest spirit as a student of our Seminary we still remember, and remembering still revere: where Martz, and Unangst, and Snyder, and Long, and Harpster, and Rowe, our fellow Alumni, have taught or are teaching the heathen how to be saved. Let

them regard the piteous wail of the children of Ham under the sweltering heats of their mid-African home, and in the assured faith that "Ethiopia shall stretch out her hands unto God," go forth in the great Master's name, and with Officer, and Carnell, and Day, preach salvation by the blood of the cross to her dusky sons. Let them heed the providential indications which present themselves in the condition of the great Island Empire of the east and unfold the banner of the cross, in the name of our Church, to the swarming millions of Japan.

Our Seminary: already a power for good beyond what human tongue can tell, may she upon the advent of her first Jubilee, now almost come to the dawn, gather up her energies for a new and still more marked advance. In time to come, as in the years that are gone, may she be in *His* keeping who has watched over her from the first, and become more than ever a potent agency in advancing the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

ARTICLE IV.

WHAT IS A FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINE?

Translated from the German by Rev. H. E. JACOBS, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.

[Two living Lutheran theologians have presented answers to this question, differing somewhat in form from that of the older theologians of our Church. As the latter will soon be made accessible to the English reader through the translation of Schmid's *Dogmatik*, we have thought that the former, referred to in Luthardt's Compend as among the best modern presentations of the subject, would be both interesting and profitable. The first answer to the question, is by Dr. Fr. A. Philippi, of Rostock, whose *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre* is universally conceded to be the most trustworthy presentation, in a modern form, of Lutheran theology. The second answer is from Dr. Fr. H. R. Frank, of Erlangen, whose *Die*

Theologie der Concordienformel, historisch-dogmatisch entwickelt und beleuchtet, is of the highest value both for its clear exhibit of the meaning of the Formula of Concord, and its exhaustive notes, forming fully one-half of the work, which present authorities sustaining the statements of the text, and supply the amplest materials for the study of each topic, in its historical relations. It will be noticed that Dr. Frank objects somewhat to Dr. Philippi's answer. The latter has replied that the difference between them is only seeming, and has resulted from the fact, that the one has developed the subject more fully than the other.]

I. THE ANSWER OF PHILIPPI.*

We have learned that the expiatory death of the God-man, through which the restoration of communion with God is imparted, and upon which it is founded, forms both the centre and the *foundation* of salvation. As this divine fact is the central *foundation fact* of salvation, so also the divine testimony to the same is the central *foundation doctrine* of salvation. Upon this foundation we rest in faith, through the subjective reception of this testimony. On it, we are placed, in so far as faith is a creation and work of God; on it, we have placed ourselves, in so far as faith is our own act, in consequence of the divine operation. Through faith in the expiatory death of the God-man, God is ours, and we have become God's; and thus we have the doctrine that through faith in this expiatory death, the reciprocal communion between God and man has been restored, and salvation and blessedness, have been acquired, attained, consummated.

Now Dogmatic Theology is nothing more than the development, in its various directions, of this central fundamental doctrine. It has to unfold all the articles of faith contained in this onedocctrine, to perceive already in the germ the type of the entire plant, and likewise thence to develop it with its stalk, and leaves, and flowers, and fruit. What now belongs to the germ, belongs also to the entire or-

**Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, 2d Ed., Vol. I., pp. 106—118.

ganic structure derived from it. The one fundamental doctrine forming the centre sets forth in itself the various ideas and doctrines of salvation that it contains; and, therefore, everything thus developed by inner necessity from this centre, is just as fundamental as the centre itself. Thus about the *central* fundamental doctrine (the constitutive article, *articulus constitutivus*, specially so called), the entire collection of *peripheral* fundamental doctrines (consecutive articles, *articuli consecutivi*) is formed, which again, on their part, enclose the centre in wider or narrower concentric circles. For as the circle is not without a centre, so also the centre is not a centre, unless there be a circle. The soul permeates and animates the entire body, and is present as an entirety in each of the members, even when, by its entirety, it is present [in any particular part] in a peculiar mode; and, hence, it is only the totality of the organs that forms the entire, animated and living body; and thus, as Luther says, if a link of the golden chain, which the articles of faith form, be broken, the entire chain is rent asunder. There is, therefore, a continuous series of divine fundamental facts, and of divine fundamental testimonies corresponding to these facts, which taken together extend back to the centre, viz. the fact of Redemption and the doctrine of Redemption, and proceed therefrom. To demonstrate and explain this organic connection of fundamental facts and fundamental doctrines with each other, and with their centre, the foundation in the narrowest sense, and to learn, therefrom, to recognize the higher or the lower fundamentality of that which is fundamental, is precisely the office of scientific theology. Yet we have to consider not only the distinction between the central, and the concentric or peripheral, but also the distinction between that which is *immediately* and that which is *mediately fundamental*. To the immediately fundamental belong all such doctrines as relate to divine facts which still continue to form the ground of our salvation, the facts of creation, of redemption and of sanctification. Here there is indeed that which is central and peripheral, but all is immediately fundamental. On the

other hand, the mediate fundamental doctrines are such as either refer to divine facts which, if they formerly constituted the foundation of our salvation, constitute it no longer (*e. g.* the original creation in the divine image); or as are not properly acts pertaining to salvation, but only acts preparatory to those of salvation, or acts of judgment following the rejection of the acts of salvation; or, as refer to human acts (*e. g.* the original and continued fall of man from God), to which the divine facts of judgment and salvation stand in the closest relation. But even these mediate fundamental doctrines still remain fundamental doctrines, in so far as they not only are inwardly connected with the immediate peripheral fundamental doctrines, but also have been organically developed with them from the one central fundamental doctrine; so that a holding in its purity of these doctrines, or an alteration of the same, must be reciprocal, as has actually been found to occur. We may name these mediate fundamental doctrines, in accordance with the expression of the fathers, although of course in a modified sense, *antecedent articles of faith* or *conservative articles of faith*.

That Jesus Christ is the foundation (*ὁ θεμέλιος*), upon which the congregation of God has been built, and on which it rests, the apostle Paul expressly testifies, 1 Cor. 8 : 11; and that, too, as the crucified, 1 Cor. 2 : 2, and risen one, 1 Cor. 15 : 14, 17, who is the Son of God manifest in the flesh, 1 Jno. 2 : 22, 23; 4 : 2, 3; the Lord, 1 Cor. 12 : 3. Hence we find also, especially in the Acts of the Apostles, that the preaching of the Apostles concerning the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, is the fundamental testimony; in this we find what the apostles presented to the congregations as the chief point (*ἐν πρώτοις*, 1 Cor. 15 : 3). Cf. Acts 2 : 22—32; 10 : 34—43; 17 : 1—4. For, through the resurrection, Jesus Christ has been sealed as the incarnate Son of God, and his death as an expiatory death, so that the founding of our salvation upon the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, is nothing else than the founding it upon the expiatory death of the God-man. But as the Apostle, 1 Cor. 3 : 11, designates Christ as the foundation-stone, so, also,

Eph. 2 : 20, he calls the entire apostolic testimony the foundation-stone (*θεμέλιος*), but calls Christ the corner-stone (*ἀκρογωνιαίος*); and hence the inference, as it may otherwise be proved from the doctrine of Scripture, regarded in its connection, that it is only Jesus Christ in his person and in his works that is the *central* foundation, and that it is only the doctrine of the crucified and risen God-man that forms the middle point in the entire sum of fundamental doctrines. Cf. Acts 16 : 30 sq.; 18 : 28 ; 20 : 21.

We have thus far sought to develop the notion of the fundamental, from the centre of our subjective experience of salvation. But this is only the reflection of the objective revelation of God. What now in this objective revelation consisting in word and deed, is to be regarded in an immediate or a mediate, in a central or peripheral way, as fundamental, will determine in us, according to the mode that has been stated, the subjective knowledge of salvation begotten of the objective revelation. But thereby the above fundamental statement or formal principle will again stand fast, that the entire objective revelation of God, in all its single parts and members, in its totality of what is essentially significant, or what is less significant, is to be received with unconditional obedience of faith, in regard to divine facts and divine testimonies, whether they be in themselves fundamental or non-fundamental. For not to believe the appointed revelation of God, or only to be willing to believe it to a certain extent, as its greater or less importance with reference to the inner life is recognized, means utterly to renounce obedience to God; and thereby faith and salvation would be entirely lost. The: "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth," marks the true position of saving faith with reference to its Lord's Word of revelation.

Thus, therefore, we are led to a further distinction, viz., that between *formal* and *material fundamental doctrines*. The former consists in the doctrine that God's revelation, in all its parts, must have the unconditional obedience of faith, even where the contents of the same neither form a point of the immediate experience of faith, nor stand in necessary

inner connection with the fundamental fact of salvation, nor can be derived from the same by simple inference. Thus, for example, the angels exercise no immediate influence upon our inner life, their existence and reality accordingly form no constituent of our immediate experience of salvation, neither are they derived from the same by inference; yet their existence and reality have been attested by the objective revelation of God, and the denial of the same is accordingly an offence against the formal fundamental doctrine of the unconditional duty of the obedience of faith to God's Word. Only as, upon the testimony of the divine Word, we accept in faith their existence and reality, do we discover the certainly remote and only very indirect relation of the same to our salvation. But we may predicate the same also in a certain sense, even of our Lord's descent into hell, and his ascension into Heaven, as well as of his future return to judgment. In these facts, there are certainly contained saving operations pertaining essentially and immediately to Redemption; but the precise acts, in which they are completed, in this their historical concrete form, have still a side, which is not inferred from the inner experience of salvation, but can be derived only from the testimony of the objective revelation. This pertains, in a certain sense, also, to the sacraments. For in itself there can be no doubt that the doctrine of the means whereby God brings salvation to us, and seals it upon us, belongs to the fundamental doctrines; but the precise form and shape of these means, divine revelation must itself deliver to us. We call these *additional* or *supplementary fundamental* doctrines, in distinction from fundamental doctrines that are so *per se*. Of course these two sides cannot in the concrete be always accurately distinguished; for a fundamental doctrine may, on the one hand, be one existing *per se*, and, on the other hand, be a supplementary fundamental doctrine as this pertains in a higher or lower degree to the doctrine last cited. Hence also Systematic Theology in reference to this topic, has in its development, received from without additional, supplementary points.

If we comprise, in a brief recapitulation, the argument

thus far given, we have accordingly divided fundamental doctrines into *formal* and *material*; the material into *supplementary* and those *existing per se*; those existing *per se*, into *central* and *peripheral*, and the peripheral, into *immediate* and *mediate* fundamental doctrines of salvation. We may then designate the totality of these fundamental doctrines as fundamental doctrines in the *wider* sense; then, among these, the material should be named fundamental doctrines in the *narrower* sense; and, in this latter class again, the immediate central and peripheral, or the sum of those divine facts and divine testimonies which continue to form the peculiar foundation of our salvation, should be called fundamental doctrines in the *narrowest* sense of the term. The last are, without doubt, the most significant and important, and so to say, fundamental doctrines properly so called. They have also been treated as such by the Church from the beginning; from the totality of that which is fundamental, they have been selected as the kernel, and have been reduced to a brief compendium. This was the summary of the doctrines, which, in the society of believers, was to be confessed as his own individual faith by the person received in Baptism, the old *regula fidei* as it has been set forth in a fixed form in the Apostles' Creed. Our salvation is founded upon faith in God the Father, the Creator; God the Son, the Redeemer; God the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier. The Apostles' Creed continues to form the abiding, and likewise the immanent foundation of all churchly confessional development. It is the root of the tree, the profile of the complete body of the Confession, the child, in which the future man is already completely foreshadowed. The entire later Confessional development is in fact only a development of the *sense* that was originally believed and confessed in the Apostolic *Credo*. It has not so much laid down new articles of faith, as, on the contrary, it has only successively unfolded the manifold germinal statements contained in the Creed. The occasion thereto was furnished by the perversion and misunderstanding of the original sense, over against which the true meaning and significance of the same had to be held inviolate. As now the

doctrine itself, so also the development of the true sense belongs to that which is fundamental; for with the true sense, the doctrine also is certainly abandoned. And in this respect, that which is fundamental has a process of development, a history. This history proceeds step by step, and synchronizes with the history of the churchly development of confession and doctrine. The church's doctrine of the Trinity, of the Person of Christ, of Sin and Grace, of Justification by Faith, of the Means of Grace, of the Church, is only an explication of the original sense of the Apostles' Creed. For not only the object of faith, but also the description of the nature of faith, is contained in the Apostles' Creed, where the "I believe" signifies not only "I recognize and acknowledge," but also "I place my entire trust in God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." But that this faith rests upon the word of the Lord, (which the ancients designated as the "organic foundation") was declared by the fact that a summary of the contents of this word was laid down in the confession of faith; and that, through Baptism and the Lord's Supper, we are placed and maintained in fellowship with the triune God, in whom we believe, and whom we confess, and that through these means we are introduced as members into the spiritual body, of which Jesus Christ is the Head, was partially contained already by implication in the article of the forgiveness of sins, and the communion of saints, and was partially a presupposition to the entire confession, through the use of which admission was granted to the sacraments of the forgiveness of sins, and saving fellowship with the Lord and his people; and by means of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, actual reception into this fellowship of salvation, and preservation therein, were afforded. In connection now with the development of these immediate fundamental doctrines, the mediate fundamental doctrines, such as the doctrines of the original divine image, and of sin, were also developed in a similar way. Thus we have therefore been led at last to the distinction between *undeveloped* and *developed fundamental doctrines*, between fundamental doctrines *originally existing*, and *those arising later and still continuing, which are nevertheless*

only the same fundamental doctrines, in a different form, in a different stage of their formation. In the degree now that the pure sense of the Apostles' Creed is abandoned and corrupted, there is an abandonment and corruption of the Apostles' Creed itself, and in the degree that this sense remains unimpaired, do we stand upon the foundation of the Apostles' Creed itself. Accordingly, the Church which entirely abandons the true sense and the true development of the central or even the peripheral fundamental doctrines, or declares them matters of indifference, ceases thereby to be the obedient servant of the Lord, the true steward of the mysteries of God, the pillar and ground of the truth (στύλος και ῥαβδίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, 1 Tim. 3: 15), and thereby banishes itself from its own abode. Therefore, sincere faith in the fundamental doctrines in their undeveloped form, yea even only in the center of the same, as the heart point including all within itself, may always suffice for salvation; whilst, under the divine guidance, and in the light of the divine Spirit, an historical development of the Confession is indispensable to a churchly condition. Thus, therefore, the distinction between the undeveloped and the developed fundamental doctrines, is founded in the distinction between *fundamentals necessary to salvation*, and *fundamentals necessary to the Church*; but, like all the distinctions thus far found, both act in harmony, and easily pass from the one into the other. For if unintentional ignorance of the development cannot interfere with salvation, conscious and persistent rejection and denial of the same, can interfere with salvation, if indeed the error be rooted not in the understanding, but in the heart, and has not shown that its presupposed sincere faith is, properly speaking, unbelief; and thus, the erroneous development of doctrine, and the expression of a certain individual appear not merely as wood, hay and stubble, but as a departure from the foundation, as an error overturning the foundation. If, in reference to a particular individual, the church may here, according to the direction of the Apostle, believe all things and hope all things, it yet dare not cover all things and suffer all things. Out of love to the erring one, and the desire to lead him to

the full truth, it dare not do this, but especially it cannot do this, because of the obedience that is due the word of her Lord, and the calling to which he has appointed her. For if she would suffer false doctrine in her midst, and would regard it any way possible to bear with error overturning the foundation, not only in the laity, in the hope of, out of love, instructing and disciplining and educating, but also in teachers and leaders, and would sanction this in her own confessions, she would thereby wantonly reject the formal foundation, and would renounce unconditional obedience to her Lord in regard to his entire and inseparable Word.

II. THE ANSWER OF FRANK.*

That there is a difference between the Œcumenical and Lutheran Confessions with reference to their truth and conformity to Scripture, in such a way that the former must be acknowledged throughout and the latter only in part, is entirely contrary to the meaning of the Formula of Concord. But, when it is afterwards said of the catechisms that they have been designed for the use of the laity, and briefly contain all that is necessary for a Christian to know, in order to attain eternal salvation, a distinction is made between that, in the confessional writings, which is more, and that which is less fundamental; and, from this point onward, the relation between the earlier and the later, the œcumenical and the particular symbols, is more accurately defined. For this purpose a new elaboration of the doctrine of fundamental statements is certainly needed, since the form of the same thus far presented from Nicholas Hunnius to Philippi, is objectionable, from the fact that it seeks mostly to draw the distinction, according to an entirely objective rule, according to the knowledge necessary for salvation. For considering the matter *per se*, who dare assert of any one of the contents of Revelation, even though the same appear to lie far from the centre of the facts of salvation, that it is either unnecessary to be known, or that it can be denied without any injury to salvation? "What thing soever I command you,

* *Die Theologie der Concordienformel*, I : 16—19.

observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." We have a right to extend this passage to the entire contents of the Old and New Testament Revelation. In fact, the Dogmaticians, in drawing the distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, have not manifested a very clear perception; not merely that they are everywhere in doubt, as to whether to designate a doctrine as non-fundamental, and evidently do not agree with each other in the statement of the same—but even when they have taken courage to name a doctrine as non-fundamental, as for example that of the immortality of man before the Fall, that of the sin and eternal damnation of the wicked angels, or that of Antichrist, they immediately add one restriction to another, whereby the denial of such article may be prejudicial to the conditions of salvation. But shall we, therefore, allow ourselves to be driven to the Romish position, that maintains that all and everything in Holy Scripture is an article of faith, or where such an assertion can be held only in theory, to that other Romish declaration, that all that lies beyond the doctrine of the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and conformity to the condition of each of the requisite sacraments, is absolutely unnecessary? Both questions are solved in a mechanical, but not in an organic way.

That which is absolutely fundamental is only one, viz. faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. From this point, that which is relative begins. But this occurs in an organic way. Jesus Christ is the living, all-penetrating centre, the kernel and star of the entire Holy Scriptures. Every part of Revelation depends organically, and after the manner of members, upon him. Thus viewed everything is fundamental, and just as in reference to the law of the Lord, he who sins in one point is guilty of all, so also especially in reference to the revelation of salvation, he who attacks a single member offers violence to the whole organism itself, and to its Head. And thus considered, there still remains only one thing that is fundamental; for as love is the fulfilling of the Law, and all else is comprehended in this one thing, so also he who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, has the entire organism of

salvation, with all else comprised in it which is necessary for blessedness.

The question, according to the change from that which is relative in the fundamental to that which is absolute, is then to be decided in accordance with the position, at the time, of the believing individual to the organism of salvation. If an individual Christian, or a Christian congregation has at any time learned to know any part of the saving revelation, as a member of the organism, this part, whether it appear in itself large or small, becomes to that individual or congregation forever fundamental. For with the despalal or rejection of even the least matter, there is a despalal and rejection of the organism itself, whose life supports and passes through even those things which are the least. The Church, which in its course through the world, has recognized and in its symbols has fixed as such, one portion of saving truth after another, can, therefore, consider none of the same otherwise than fundamental. *For the Church*, I say, everything is fundamental that it has obtained, in reference to doctrine, from the Scriptures, and has fixed in its confessional writings; and here is the point, in which every union in doctrine between two churches must be frustrated. But *in the Church*, there exists partly that which is equally, partly that which is less, and partly also that which is more fundamental than that of the Church itself. Of the shepherds and teachers of the Church, such a degree of knowledge must as a rule be required, that to them everything, even to the least point, is fundamental, that is fundamental to the Church. But of the laity, only such a degree of faith, is, as a rule, to be demanded, that, founded upon that which is absolutely fundamental, they may gradually grow up, under the training of the Church, to the heights of churchly knowledge. Finally, in a still smaller number, whose personal knowledge of salvation is more comprehensive than that of the Church, the extent of that which is fundamental is increased in proportion as they have entered, in a still greater degree than the Confession, into the depths and remote places of the organism of salvation.

ARTICLE V.

ERASMUS AND LUTHER, AS REPRESENTATIVES OF UN-SANCTIFIED AND OF SANCTIFIED LEARNING AND ACTIVITY.

By Rev. B. SADTLER, D. D., Lutherville, Md.

The wisdom of the ancients taught the existence of four elements—earth, water, air and fire. They supposed these to be the basis of the numberless combinations found in nature. Modern science has discovered that they are not elements, but are themselves compounds. The separate constituents are of no practical utility—nay, perfectly pure oxygen or nitrogen may be agents of ruin. Only in combination they minister to man's wants and fulfil the great ends for which the Creator designed them. Accordingly we may breathe the atmosphere, drink the water, gather our food from the earth, because in this partnership of elements, each does its share to supply just the ingredients that compose the united whole and make it a good gift of God.

So too we may analyze character and find its constituent elements. If we may not dissect a soul, we may examine its component traits and propensities. It is the due and proper admixture of these elementary principles that constitutes a perfect character. The excessive development and undue growth of any one propensity, trait, or even whole department of our mental and moral nature may make man a monster; certainly it will make him a perverted being. We may not cultivate the intellect alone. The knowledge that is power for good must be guided by right affections, pure desires and holy aims. The knowledge that is power for evil is akin to that of the fallen Lucifer—son of the morning in brightness of intellect, but prince of darkness in the objects of his affection and decisions of his will. We may not cultivate our sensibilities, or our affectional nature, alone, to the exclusion of the other departments of our mind. Unreasoning love may be strong, but so is the hurricane, and both can destroy.

Love is not always lovely—it may love self inordinately, it may cherish others idolatrously. A proper comprehension of duty would have saved it from its error. A perfectly well balanced, harmoniously developed mind is a greater rarity than at first sight might appear. There are fewer perfectly sound minds than the mass of mankind imagine. Our idiosyncrasies, our eccentricities, our weaknesses, our mental and moral peculiarities are, when not hereditary, but modified forms of disorder of the intellect or sensibilities, and tell that our education was improperly conducted. An illustration of the evil of allowing an undue prominence to one power of the mind, is furnished by Madame De Stael in her *Reflections on the Character and Writings of Rousseau*. Says she: "I believe that imagination was the strongest of his faculties and that it had almost absorbed all the rest. He dreamed rather than existed, and the events of his life might be said more properly to have passed in his mind than without him: a mode of being, one should have thought, that ought to have secured him from distrust, as it prevented him from observation; but the truth was, it did not hinder him from attempting to observe; it only rendered his observations erroneous. That his soul was tender, no one can doubt after having read his works; but his imagination sometimes interposed between his reason and his affections and destroyed their influence; he appeared sometimes void of sensibility; but it was because he did not perceive objects as they were. Had he seen them with our eyes, his heart would have been more affected than ours." The judgment she passed was too charitable; he lived within himself until he lived only to himself. He forgot the claims of God; to him Rousseau was God; he forgot the claims of social life, and when his own children were born, forthwith sent them to the Foundling Hospital.

In short the ideal of man's life is the proper admixture of all the elements that compose human character. It is a noble pursuit to cultivate the mind, but it is not enough. Our affectional nature must not be neglected, giving the heart the opportunity to pour out its blessed sympathies upon objects

proportionately to their claims and worth. But even yet the right standard of manhood is not attained. The man of wisdom and of feeling must be the man of action. Light, love, life, are the words that tell the whole story of man's proper being, for they tell of the instructed mind, the warm heart, the holy activity that make living but the resultant of that instructed mind and warm heart.

The highest of illustrations of the accomplishment of this ideal of our being, is furnished by the life of the God-man. Speaking of the character of Christ, the eloquent Dr. Channing says: "I will only observe that it had one distinction, which, more than anything, forms a perfect character. It was made up of contrasts: in other words, it was a union of excellencies which are not easily reconciled, which seem at first sight incongruous, but which, when blended and duly proportioned, constitute moral harmony, and attract with equal power, love and veneration. For example, we discover in Jesus Christ an unparalleled dignity of character, a consciousness of greatness, never discovered or approached by any other individual in history; and yet this was blended with a condescension, loveliness and unostentatious simplicity, which had never before been thought consistent with greatness. In like manner, he united an utter superiority to the world, to its pleasures and ordinary interests, with suavity of manners, and freedom from austerity. He joined to strong feeling and self-possession, an indignant sensibility to sin, and compassion for the sinner; an intense devotion to his work, and calmness under opposition and ill-success; a universal philanthropy and a susceptibility of private attachments, the authority which became the Saviour of the world, and the tenderness and gratitude of a son."

"As is he, so are we in the world," spake the apostle, and sacred history abounds with the records of men who strove to make that life the model of their own. But general history abounds more fully with the records of men, who, with varied excellencies, fell far, far short. They were but in part what man should be, and, hence, they did but in part what man should do. With a practical aim in view, to enforce the

importance of the harmonious, complete cultivation of our whole being, we propose to consider *Erasmus and Luther as representatives of unsanctified and of sanctified learning and activity.*

Erasmus Desiderius was born October 28th, 1467, in Rotterdam, and hence is generally known under the name of Erasmus of Rotterdam. His mother was the daughter of a physician in Gouda, in the South of Holland; his father was from the same place, a man of ability and fine culture, designed by his family for monastic life. To escape a compulsory adoption of the cowl, he fled from home, leaving her, whom he would have married, had he been permitted, on the eve of becoming a mother. The child assumed the father's name of Gerhard, and, in subsequent life, in accordance with the practice of the age, among the learned, he translated it into Greek and Latin, and it is known to history as Erasmus, or Desiderius, all meaning, Well-beloved. During the father's exile in Rome, he was falsely informed by his parents that his loved Margaret had died, and, overwhelmed with grief, he obeyed their wishes and entered the priesthood. Returning to his native land, he too late discovered the imposition; the irrevocable vow of celibacy had been uttered. The unfortunate and erring parents concentrated their love on their child, and sought to secure him the best instruction. In his sixth year he was sent to Utrecht, where he performed the duty of choir boy in the cathedral, and at the same time was initiated into the sciences. Thence he was removed to Devanter where his progress was so marked that, in his twelfth year his essays attracted the notice of the celebrated Agricola, who prophesied his future eminence as a scholar.

About this time he lost his parents, and his guardians removed him to Herzogenbresch to prepare for the priesthood. Here he spent ten years, acquiring but little knowledge, but receiving abundant abuse. Thence he returned to Gouda and, against his preferences and tastes, was induced by the persuasions of his friend Verdenus to enter the monastery of Emaus, near his ancestral home. Here he spent five years, in discontent and disgust with monastic life, but diligently

studying the classics and cultivating his own style. A brief respite from his irksome confinement was afforded him by the invitation of the Archbishop of Cambray to accompany him to Rome. In 1492 he received his consecration as priest, but still dissatisfied with his vocation he obtained permission to visit Paris and study scholastic theology. He pursued his studies with indefatigable zeal, under the pressure of extreme poverty. He sought to support himself by teaching, and applied his means first to the purchase of books and then of clothing. From this time he rose rapidly in fame as a writer and scholar. Upon invitation of Lord Mountjoy he visited England and was the cherished guest of the great and learned of the nation. By none was he more cordially cherished than by the eminent Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas More. It is said that their first meeting was at the Lord Mayor's table, but they were unknown to each other. A dispute arising on some theological points, Erasmus expressed himself with great severity of the clergy, and ridiculed, with considerable acrimony, the doctrine of transubstantiation. More rejoined with all his strength of argument and keenness of wit. Erasmus thus assailed, exclaimed with some vehemence, "*Aut tu Morrus es, aut nullus*"—you are either More or no one—to which More with great readiness replied, "*Aut tu es Erasmus, aut Diabolus*"—either you are Erasmus or the devil. Sir Thomas seemed to have gained the victory in this contest of wit and argument, but soon after Erasmus repaid him with interest. More had lent him a horse, which he took over with him to Holland. Instead of returning it to the owner, he sent him the following epigram, intended as an answer to the former arguments of Sir Thomas on the subject of transubstantiation:—

"*Quod mihi dixisti
De corpore Christi
Crede quod edas, et edis;
Sive tibi rescribo,
De tuo palfrido,
Credo quod habeas, et habes."*

"*Of Christ's body you said,
Believe that 'tis bread,
And bread it surely will be;
Thus to you I write back—
Believe that your hack
Is with you, and with you is he."*

Returning to France and the Netherlands he continued his

career as profound student. In 1506 he visited Italy, everywhere greeted as the learned man of his age. In Turin the doctorate of theology was conferred upon him, but in Bologna, the superstitious populace, mistaking his official robes for the dress of the plague doctors, stoned him and endangered his life. This led him to apply to the Pope for absolution from his monastic vows, and, succeeding in his application, he forever forsook a vocation which from first to last he had detested.

From Italy he returned, upon invitation of Henry VIII. to England and for a while filled a Professorship of Greek in Cambridge University. During this visit to England he published his "Praise of Folly,"—a book abounding in keen sarcasm and biting invective against the monks from the Carmelite beggar up to the Pope. Leaving England, he finally, after brief residences in various places, settled in Basle. There he associated himself with the publisher Frobenius, and in 1516 presented to the Christian world the great work of his life—the first printed edition of the New Testament in Greek. Of it he himself wrote: "Would to God that this work may bear as much fruit to Christianity as it has cost me toil and application." At this time he was beyond doubt the most influential man in Christendom, and monarchs, nobles, the pope and the masses delighted to honor him for his genius and attainments.

The question arises how are we to estimate this man, in the relation he sustained to the truth? His earlier writings undoubtedly were in its interest. His intellectual convictions were right, but in the hour of trial they failed to hold him in bondage to the truth, because it was not an experimental power in his soul. What more orthodox utterance could be desired than the following passage, from one of his letters, affords: "The sum of all Christian philosophy amounts to this: to place all our hopes in God alone, who by his free grace, without any merit of our own, gives us every thing through Christ Jesus; to know that we are redeemed by the death of his Son; to be dead to worldly lusts; and to walk in conformity with his doctrine and example."

Yet when the time came to take sides, he basely forsook the truth, and lent his influence to error. He was like Noah's carpenters; they aided in building the ark but remained without themselves. Most powerfully did he contribute to advance the interests of true doctrine and real piety, but when the time came to stand forward boldly upon the platform he had helped to rear, he retreated. He was a Nicodemus; willing to go to Jesus by night, but not by day. Luther rightly judged him when he declared, "Erasmus is very capable of exposing error, but he knows not how to teach the truth." Simple is the reason; piety is positive and aggressive and that piety ruled not in his heart.

Erasmus never formally broke with the Church of Rome and it never broke with him. Whilst the mass of the monks cursed him as a heretic and flatly declared, "Erasmus laid the egg and Luther hatched it;" on the other hand the Pope and the Catholic princes petted and flattered him and bribed his powerful pen at the price of their royal favor. When he published an edition of the Greek New Testament and the monks exclaimed "He presumes to correct the Holy Ghost," because in his annotations he showed that the Vulgate abounded with errors, the Pope sent him a diploma. Of it he wrote to a friend: "The pope has sent me a diploma full of kindness and honorable testimonials. His secretary declares that this is an unprecedented honor, and that the Pope dictated every word himself."

When he took sides against the Reformation and the truth, he undoubtedly acted in opposition to his own convictions and conscience. In an interview which Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony, had with him at Cologne in 1520, after a long hesitation in giving any decided opinion as to the justice of Luther's course, he finally gave the evasive answer, "Luther has sinned in two things, namely, in that he has touched the crown of the Pontiff and the stomachs of the monks." When the town council of Basle required his opinion, upon Ecolampadius' book upon the Eucharist, he replied: "I have read the book and in my opinion it is learned, perspicuous and thorough, I will even add pious, if

any thing can be pious that opposes the sentiment and consent of the Church, to dissent from which I hold to be dangerous." Yet in his soul he was all the while dissenting from that Church; he was a Protestant without protesting—too timid to face opposition, too selfish to allow his own comfort and ease to be disturbed by girding himself for the toil and arming himself for the strife. It was certainly an honest confession when he said, "Let others aspire to martyrdom: as for me I do not think myself worthy of such an honor. I fear if any disturbance were to arise, I should imitate Peter in his fall."

Why this vacillation, this unfaithfulness to inner conviction, this alliance with the enemies of the truth? Doubtless in the fact that Erasmus could not say with Paul, "the love of Christ constraineth us." There was knowledge profound and varied, but the faith that makes the saint, and if need be the martyr, was wanting. He found it as true as it was when it was written, "Without faith it is impossible to please God." As his life drew near to its close he became the unhappiest of men. He called his life a cruel life and longed for death. Retaining his speech to the last, his dying words were, "Mercy, sweet Jesus, how long? Jesus, fountain of all mercy." He added in German, "Dear God, have mercy upon me, O my God, be merciful to me." Whether that mercy reached his soul, the Great Judge has determined, we may not know. "Unstable as water thou shalt not excel." His own church has disowned him. In bitter invective an author of his own communion exclaims: "Shall he be held up as a true teacher of the churches and preacher of the spiritual life! He dies in an heretical city, among heretics, as his best friends and pupils. He dies in their arms without asking for a Catholic priest. He goes hence without receiving the sacraments of the church or without even desiring them; without in the least concerning himself whether he shall be buried in Catholic fashion or not,—yea, without revealing the remotest proof of his faith in his last will." His works have long since been put in the *Codex Expurgatorius*, by his church.

Protestantism has no honors for him beyond what she accords to simple learning. The world has felt his presence, his life has left its impress but it has awakened but little enthusiasm, but little gratitude. Powers such as he had, consecrated to God and man, sanctified by the Spirit of truth, laid upon the altar as an offering to their Giver, would have made him a prince in Israel, a spiritual Saul, head and shoulders above his fellows, hero and philosopher—the impersonation of his own name—Erasmus, Desiderius, Gerhard, well-beloved of God and man!

Let us introduce another great actor in the exciting drama of the 16th century. We select Martin Luther as a representative of sanctified learning.

Wilfully blind must he be that does not discern the providence of God in many of the discoveries and inventions of men. The great battle between truth and error was to be fought, not with squadrons and divisions, sword and cannon, but with the bullets of the brain and the batteries of the printing-press. Accordingly the art of printing was discovered in 1440, just as God was ready, through that wonderful event that marked the beginning of the next century, to say "Let there be light." Luther was to be fitted for his work, as the true herald of Christ, to publish to the nations the long-hidden truth as his Master had revealed it. Accordingly a revival of learning preceded the great revival in the Church. A Reuchlin is raised up to introduce the study of the Hebrew into Christian Universities and re-open the long closed pages of the Old Testament to the student of the word in the language in which the Holy Ghost had given it. He had the honor and merit of publishing the first Hebrew Grammar and Dictionary. What he did for the Hebrew Scriptures, Erasmus did for the Greek. Strange that both these men after aiding so powerfully in advancing the truth should so pertinaciously cling to the old error. Both were actual reformers; neither would confess it.

Such were Luther's forerunners! The circumstances of *his* life are too well known to require any detailed biographical sketch. Born in 1483 in Eisleben, of poor parents, we may

easily understand that his education could only be acquired by great exertions and under great privations on his own part. His schools were the Latin school at Mansfeldt, then at Madgeburg, and finally the University of Erfurth. It is a striking commentary upon the deep darkness of the dark ages, that the Latin Grammar he used in acquiring the knowledge of the language was published by the master of St. Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate, in the 4th century. In 1505 Luther received his degree of M. A. and of Doctor of Philosophy. It was not until he entered the cloister that he mastered the Greek and Hebrew languages and qualified himself for one of the greatest works of his life—the translation of the Scriptures into his vernacular tongue. In 1508 he was called to a professorial chair in the newly founded University of Wittenberg. He was assigned dialectics and philosophy, and eminent was his success in his vocation.

But it is time we should ask whether this education and these attainments were sanctified. There is abundant evidence of seriousness from his very childhood, but two events conspired to awaken his attention more powerfully and to induce him to consecrate himself to God according to the fashion of the day. The one was the assassination of his friend Alexis; the other was his escape from death, when, overtaken by a thunder storm on his return to Erfurth from a visit to his friends, the bolt fell directly at his feet. There he made the vow to retire from the world and serve God alone. He entered the city, parted from his friends and sought admission to the monastery.

Alas! he soon found that *the place* does not give peace and hope. He fasts and prays, tortures himself and mortifies the flesh; all in vain. He needs more than all this, and Christ alone can give it. Staupitz, the Vicar General of his order, discovered his distress and led his soul to the Lamb of God. He presented him with a Bible and gave him the advice; "Let the study of the Scriptures be your favorite occupation." With the dawn of faith in his soul, the Reformation really dawned on the world. It consecrated all his work. When he first learned that salvation was of grace, and justi-

fication by faith, he did not at once see that these simple truths were the mighty levers that would upheave and overthrow the whole system of Rome's works of righteousness. He soon discovered it and as soon proclaimed it. In 1507 he was ordained priest and the spirit in which he received his consecration will appear from an extract from a letter he wrote to his friend Brauer: "God, who is glorious and holy in all his works, having most graciously condescended to raise me up—me, a wretched and in all respects unworthy sinner, and to call me by his sole and most free mercy to his sublime ministry; I ought in order to testify my gratitude for such divine and magnificent goodness (as far at least as mere dust and ashes can do it,) to fulfill with my whole heart the duties of the office entrusted to me." Summoned to preach by Staupitz, he replied: "No, no! it is no slight thing to speak before men in the place of God." Forced to submit, such was the impression his warm hearted eloquence made that soon the church could not contain the people, and he is called by the town council to be chaplain of the city church. In 1512 he was created licentiate and Doctor of Divinity and took the oath: "I swear to defend the evangelical truth with all my might."

Thus fully called and equipped, furnished with an inner living piety, and profound erudition, he is embarked for the voyage and work of life. What have been his works? Fidelity to every trust committed to him, marked his whole career. He rises to lecture in the halls of the University, and crowds throng to hear his words, that come from a soul made pure in the fountain of grace and a mind adorned with wisdom from the stores of classic and philosophic lore. He goes to the Confessional, and there error finds him, and he confronts it. Deluded sinners come with their unholy receipts in full, their indulgences in payment of sin, and the stern man of God demands repentance or refuses absolution. Duty will not allow him to shrink, and the sword of the Spirit is drawn against imposture and error, never to be sheathed again until the crack of doom. On the 31st October, 1517, the first formal blow is struck as the hammer nails

his ninety-five theses to the door of the church of All-Saints. Thenceforth by his academic lectures, by his disputations, by his sermons, and by his untiring pen, as he gets light, he gives it. He lived his soul; his was a transparent life, reproducing his own convictions, in every picture he held up to the gaze of his fellow-men. His testimony is solemnly given: "I entered into this controversy without any definite plan, without knowledge or inclination; I was taken quite unawares, and I call God, the Searcher of hearts, to witness."

Should we present him to your view, at the conference before the Pope's legate at Augsburg, we will find him not the ambitious sectary that would win a name and secure a party, but the man of faith, to whom truth is holier than life is dear. Urged to refuse going to meet the false Italian, he answers: "The Lord's will be done! Even at Augsburg in the midst of his enemies God reigns. Let Christ live; let Luther die, and every sinner, according as it is written! May the God of my salvation be exalted!" Asked by his crafty opponent, striving to work upon his fears, "When all forsake you, where will you take refuge"—looking up to the skies, he responds: "Under heaven."

The sublimity of his faith, in the presence of the Emperor and the Diet at Worms, has become familiar by frequent reference to it, and we need not dwell upon it. His life was hanging upon a word from the haughty monarch—human help seemed vain, and he can say: "I cannot and will not retract, for it is unsafe for a Christian to speak against his conscience. Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise; may God help me! Amen!"

The emphatic testimony of Thomas Carlyle is given in these words: "The Diet of Worms, Luther's appearance there on the 19th of April, 1521, may be considered as the greatest scene in modern European history; the point indeed, from which the whole subsequent history of civilization takes its rise. After multiplied negotiations, disputations, it had come to this. The young Emperor, Charles Fifth, with all the Princes of Germany, Papal nuncios, dignitaries spiritual and temporal, are assembled there; Luther

is to appear and answer for himself, whether he will recant or not. The world's pomp and power sits there on this hand: on that stands up for God's truth, one man, the poor miner, Hans Luther's son. Friends had reminded him of Huss, advised him not to go; he would not be advised. A large company of friends rode out to meet him, with still more earnest warnings; he answered, 'Were there as many devils in Worms as there are roof tiles, I would on.' The people on the morrow as he went to the hall of the Diet, crowded the windows and house-tops, some of them calling out to him, in solemn words, not to recant. 'Whosoever denieth me before men!' they cried to him,—as in a kind of solemn petition or adjuration. Was it not in reality our petition too, the petition of the whole world, lying in dark bondage of soul, paralyzed under a black spectral nightmare and triple-batted chimera, calling itself Father in God, and what not: 'Free us; it rests with thee; desert us not.' Luther did not desert us.."

In his enforced retirement at the Wartburg, the most blessed work is engaging his attention that could occupy the thought and labor of man. He is unsealing the Scriptures and translating them into German, that the famishing multitudes may have the bread of life, that the deluded masses may know where to find a safe guide to the blessed home. Koenig in his *Life of Luther*, indicates of his heroic protests and subsequent patient toil in translating the word of God: "Luther's struggle against Rome, so prominent in the history of the world, may be reduced to distinct groupings in three words, 'Wittenberg, Worms, Wartburg.' From Wittenberg emanated the loud and ever increasing protest against the degradation and enslaving of Christian truth, against the depravity of the visible Church. At Worms the right to freedom of conscience was vindicated, and, we may say, solemnly admitted into the world by an act of courage arising from conviction. At the Wartburg, finally, the labor was begun which gave to the nation, at the same time, the most powerful weapon against spiritual slavery and the most fruitful germ of religious progress and development." The learned

Bunsen asserts that the result of the translation of the Scriptures was a literary and political blessing as well as a religious one: "By choosing the Franconian dialect in use in the imperial chancery, Luther made himself intelligible both to those whose vernacular dialect was High German or Low German. Luther translated faithfully but vernacularly, with a native grace which up to this day makes his Bible the standard of the German language. It is Luther's genius applied to the Bible which has preserved the only unity, which is in our days, remaining to the German nation,—that of language, literature and thought. There is no similar instance in the known history of the world of a single man achieving such a work." But time would fail "to tell the labors of love and deeds of heroism of this man of God. The herculean labors that weighed upon his life and under which he sank at comparatively an early age, will appear from the following facts:—In the interval between 1517 and 1546, he published seven hundred and fifteen books—averaging one every two weeks. From 1517 to 1527 he published three hundred of the number. To Spalatin he wrote: "Deliver me, I beseech you: I am so overwhelmed with others' business, that my life is a burden to me. Martin Luther, courtier, in spite of himself, though not belonging to the court. I am fully occupied; being visitor, reader, preacher, author, auditor, actor, footman, wrestler, and I know not what besides." Everywhere the same in spirit and zeal; whether in the bosom of his family or in halls of learning; whether where the pestilence rages and death holds carnival, or where nobles and princes seek his services—everywhere the man of God, even unto death. So profound were his convictions that even dearest friends were nothing to him, if not true to the truth. When Melanchthon was negotiating at Augsburg, and in his desire for peace was yielding too much to Rome, Luther stiffened his backbone on this wise: "I understand that you have begun a marvelous work, namely to make Luther and the Pope agree together; but the Pope will say that he will not, and Luther begs to be excused. Should you however, after all, succeed in your affair, I will follow

your example and make an agreement between Christ and Belial. Take care that you give not up the justification by faith; that is the heel of the seed of the woman to crush the serpent's head. * * Now mind, if you mean to shut up that glorious eagle, the gospel, in a sack, as sure as Christ lives, Luther will come to deliver that eagle with might."

On the other hand, self was to be esteemed as nothing, so the truth might live. Surely advice could not be more disinterested, as he writes to the Elector of Saxony: "Be obedient, as elector, to your superiors; give way to his imperial majesty, according to the laws of the empire; and do not oppose or resist the temporal power, if it seeks to capture or kill you; for no one is to oppose or resist the powers that be, except He who has appointed them; otherwise it is rebellion against God."

Carlyle's own eminent ability and attainments make him an intelligent judge, as he testifies to the great Reformer's place in literature: "Luther's merit in literary history is the greatest; his dialect became the language of all writing. * * In no books have I found a more robust, genuine, I will say noble faculty of a man than in these. A rugged honesty, homeliness, simplicity; a rugged, stirring sense and strength. * * Good humor too, nay tender affection, nobleness and depth: this man could have been a poet too! He had to work an Epic Poem, not write one. I call him a great thinker; as indeed his greatness of heart already betokens that."

Richter says of Luther's words: "His words were half battles."

This man not only could have been a poet, he was one; if lacking the smoothness of the sonneteer, he has a combined tenderness and strength that win the heart with the ear. He early discerned the power of music and poetry in the services of the sanctuary. In 1524, he already published the first German hymn book, containing only eight hymns. This he increased to forty, next year. Among them is the famous one: "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott." It has been rightly called the Marseillaise of the Reformation.

The friend of popular education, the liberal scholar, as well
Vol. V. No. 4.

as the patriot, speaks in his famed address to the German nobles and cities: "Oh, my dear Germans," he exclaims, "the divine word is now in abundance offered to you. God knocks at your door; open it to him! Forget not the poor youth. Look how the ancient Jewish, Greek, and Roman world lost the word of God and perished. The strength of a town does not consist in its towers and buildings, but in counting a great number of learned, serious, honest, well-educated citizens. Do not fancy Hebrew and Greek to be unnecessary. These languages are the sheath, which covers the sword of the Spirit. The ignorance of the original Scriptures was an impediment to the progress of the Waldenses, whose doctrine is perfectly pure. How could I have combated and overthrown pope and sophists, even having the true faith, if I had not possessed the languages? You must found libraries for learned books,—not only the fathers, but also the pagan writers, the fine arts, law, history, medicine, must be represented in such collections."

What he did, in every sphere and in every act, he did as unto the Lord. No charge of sordidness can ever attach to his name. Copyright laws might have existed in vain for him.

In 1529 the Elector, John the Constant, wished to honor him with a share in a silver mine at Schneeberg, as a compliment for the translation of the Bible. His reply: "I have never taken a penny for my translation, and never asked it. If I did not feel such a painful concern for His sake who died for me, the whole world could not give me money enough to write a book or to translate any portion of the Bible. I am not willing to be rewarded by the world for my labor: the world is too poor for that."

No other theory will account for the sublime steadfastness and activity of that life. It was more than mere natural energy and decision of character. Doubtless he would have been a man of vigor and force anywhere and under any circumstances, but the explanation does not satisfy. Ambition for fame, intense selfishness, the impelling force of strong passion may make men do great deeds, but not deeds great in their goodness. Alexander and Cæsar, Tamerlane and Napoleon, were men of decision, and the world accords them

the praise of greatness. But a Paul and Luther, a Howard and Harms, were more than great. Faith in God made their lives sublime. They counted the cost, but, the decision made, they laid all—every interest and aim—energy and power—upon the altar. God honors them that honor him, and they are the world's favorites, humanity's heroes—almost idols. Erasmus never forgot self, and though learned beyond competition in his day and generation, who reads his works, who lingers over the story of his life with ever fresh delight? The student alone disentombs his writings and gleans the account of his life, sometimes great, often cowardly, selfish, vain and mean.

Most just is the estimate the learned critic we have already quoted, sets upon the motive of the Reformer's aim and work: "Perhaps no man of so humble peaceable a disposition ever filled the world with contention. We cannot but see, he would have loved privacy, quiet diligence in the shade; that it was against his will he ever became a notoriety. Notoriety: what would that do for him? The goal of his march through this world was the Infinite Heaven; an indubitable goal for him: in a few years he should either have attained that or lost it forever! We will say nothing at all, I think, of that sorrowfullest of theories, of its being some mean shopkeeper grudge of the Augustine Monk against the Dominican, that first kindled the wrath of Luther and produced the Protestant Reformation. We will say to the people who maintain it, if indeed any such exist now: Get first into the sphere of thought by which it is as much as possible to judge of Luther, or of any man like Luther, otherwise than distractedly; we may then begin arguing with you."

A Paul before him could account to the world for his greatness, by what he designed as the confession of his humility: "By the grace of God I am what I am." The same potential cause sanctified Luther's native talents and acquired learning, and the product was the grand hero, that, more than any other, has filled the world's gaze for the centuries past, and will for the centuries to come.

ARTICLE IX.

HEBREWS XIII. 10.

"We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle."

This passage has some things in it which entitle it to special consideration. It is the only passage in the New Testament in which the word *altar*, *θυσιαστήριον*, is used specifically in reference to Christian service or Christian privileges. The word is a very common one in the Bible, especially in the Old Testament and not unknown in the New, but is here employed to express something belonging to the rights and immunities of the Christian dispensation. When it is said, "we have," evidently the apostle includes himself and his fellow Christians. The term *altar* has been the subject of no little controversy in the church, some taking occasion from it to argue in favor of the whole system of priesthood and sacrifices, in the Christian Church, and others wishing to discard the very name as having no proper place under the dispensation of the Spirit. As usual, it may perhaps be found that the truth is not with either extreme.

The term *θυσιαστήριον*, altar, is from *θυσιαζω*, to sacrifice, and designates that on which sacrifices and oblations were offered, and especially the altar for burnt offerings. Gen. 8 : 20 ; 12 : 7, 8 ; 13 : 18 ; Ex. 27 : 1, etc. It was used also for the altar of incense, *θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος*, Ex. 30 : 1, etc.

In the New Testament, we find it used in such cases as the following: Matt. 5 : 23, 24 ; 23 : 18, etc. Rom. 11 : 3 ; Heb. 7 : 13, and elsewhere. Sometimes it is used for the victims or sacrifices offered upon the altar. In 1 Cor. 9 : 13, we read, "and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar." The idea is they share in the sacrifices offered upon the altar. In the passage before us, to eat of the altar is to

feast upon the sacrificial offering. MacKnight says, "Here, by an usual metonymy, the *altar* is put for the *sacrifice*, as is plain from the Apostle's adding, 'of which they have no right to eat.'"

The word *ἐξουσίαν*, "*right*" is of doubtful authority, but the sense would not be materially affected if it were left out. Those who are referred to as having no right to eat of this altar are those, Jews, who continue to hold on to the old types and shadows, and refuse the substance, or the true sacrifice. They serve the tabernacle. They cling to the old and refuse to accept the new.

The general meaning of the writer is plain enough. He has been arguing the superiority of Christianity over Judaism. This he has shown in various particulars, and has proved most conclusively that Christianity is the very reality and substance of which the other was only the type or shadow. Those who embrace Christianity lose nothing but gain every thing. Here he turns the argument against the Jews, who are unwilling to exchange the service of the tabernacle for that of the Gospel. Christians not only lose nothing, but those who oppose Christianity for the sake of continuing under the law of outward ceremonies are the losers. "We have an altar of which they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." Yes, Christians have an altar, the true altar, and they eat of the sacrifice of which others have no right to eat.

But, while the general meaning is plain enough, what are we to understand by the word *altar*, or to what does this term here refer? We have no literal altar, and none is needed. For Christ by the one offering of Himself has made an end of sacrifice for sin, and with the end of sacrifice has abolished the need of altars and victims.

Some understand it to refer distinctly to the Lord's Supper. Ebrard, in Olshausen's Commentary, says, "The author evidently has in his mind the holy supper, the meal of spiritual life-fellowship and union with the for us dead and now exalted Saviour." In harmony with such a view, some regard the communion table as such an altar, and the bread

and wine as a sacrificial offering, and the officiating minister as performing the office of priest. With many who do not accept the views of the Roman Catholic Church, that the mass is a true and proper sacrifice for sin, there is still the idea of an altar and a sacrifice in the Lord's Supper.

Against such an application of this text there are serious if not insuperable objections. Nowhere in the New Testament when speaking expressly of the Lord's Supper is the word *altar* employed, or any term that would indicate such an idea. The inspired writers have most carefully been preserved from giving any authority or sanction to such a view of the Lord's Supper. It is said that "Christ our passion is sacrificed for us," and we are exhorted to "keep the feast not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." Various names or terms are employed by the sacred writers to express this sacrament of the New Testament, such as "The Lord's table," "The Lord's Supper," "The breaking of bread," etc., but nowhere is it specifically called an *altar*. This would have been very easy and most natural if the inspired writers had wished to convey any such idea of this sacrament. Nor do we find any such idea in the early church, or in the times immediately succeeding the apostles. For a time the New Testament simplicity prevailed, and it was only after a season, and gradually that the sacerdotal idea of the ministry, with altars and sacrifices, crept into the Christian Church. To the charge of not having shrines or altars, the early Christians confessed that they had no altars. They did not call the Lord's table by that name. In Malachi 1 : 7, "altar" and "table of the Lord" seem to be used interchangeably, and this may be used as an argument in favor of such use by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But such an argument cannot weigh much against the uniform usage of the New Testament.

In our Evangelical Lutheran Church we have retained the word *altar* in connection with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It is called the, "*sacrament of the altar*." But it is carefully guarded against misapprehension. Melancthon

says in the Apology, on "Sacraments and their proper use," "We teach, that the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross was alone sufficient for the sins of the whole world, and that we need no other sacrifice besides this. We have no order of priests in the new covenant, like the Levitical, as the Epistle to the Hebrews proves."

We have no sufficient reason for supposing that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had definitely in his mind the Lord's Supper when he said, "*We have an altar.*"

But, on the other hand, are we to exclude it, and with it are we to exclude the altar idea from the Christian Church? This would be to reject the word of God, and to be wiser than inspired wisdom. If the apostle uses the term, surely we need not hesitate to employ it. He says, in reply to ignorant prejudice, "we have an altar," and it is one of which Christians alone have the right to partake. We should not surrender our dearest rights to Judaisers on the one hand, or to Rationalists on the other.

The use of the term *altar*, in Christian churches or in Christian literature, may be regarded in the same light as the use of many other terms, such as passover, mercy seat, sacrifice, incense, etc., etc., some of which are even transferred to the service of the sanctuary above. We need not be afraid to use language sanctioned by inspiration, and yet we should be careful not to pervert or abuse such language to the teaching of error.

Whilst not referring specifically to the Lord's Supper, this ordinance is not to be excluded from the meaning of the apostle. As when our Saviour said in the synagogue at Capernaum: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world:" and again, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;" He did not refer to the literal eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper; but neither did he exclude that ordinance from His meaning; so here, whilst the Lord's Supper is not definitely and specifically intended, we need not exclude it

from the apostle's meaning. The Lord's Supper is a feast upon a sacrifice. Christ as our High Priest, and Himself as the costly sacrifice, did offer up His life, upon the altar of God, for the sin of the world. This sacrifice is declared to be meat indeed and drink indeed. This great truth, the priesthood of Christ, the atoning sacrifice, fellowship with Him by participating in the redemption which is in His blood—partaking at His altar, eating His flesh and drinking His blood—this should be central in the mind of the Church, and in Christian consciousness. This thought the writer has elaborated throughout most of this epistle. If he seems sometimes to wander, he returns again and again to his main subject. He would have his readers fully understand that Christians have rejected nothing of the substance of the old dispensation, or of the true and essential nature of worship and religion. Only the outward forms have passed away. Believers in Christ alone enjoy the richest blessings of redeeming love and grace. Theirs is "the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man," theirs the true altar on which "Christ through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God," theirs the 'shedding of blood without which there is no remission,' theirs an entrance "into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us," theirs "the Mediator of the new covenant, and the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel," theirs a heavenly home, "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

ARTICLE VII.

THE COLLEGIATE EDUCATION ADAPTED TO THE WANTS OF
THE PRESENT DAY.*

By Rev. J. B. HELWIG, M. A., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.

To the President and Members of the

Board of Directors of Wittenberg College.

In the observations which I am permitted to address to you, my first duty, as I apprehend it, and in which you will also join me, is to express the sentiment of gratitude to God for the prosperity and the usefulness which, under His blessings, have attended your institution of learning in its past history. The second President of Wittenberg College, upon his induction into the office of Professor of Christian Theology, and virtually also at the same time as the President of the College, addressed an audience from this place, upon the inquiry: "What shall Wittenberg College be and do in its theological relations." And you will again join me in the acknowledgment due to him who then spoke, and who by divine favor still remains in our midst, for his unwavering devotion to the best interests of the College and the churches which you synodically represent.

With these brief, and I trust admissible, references to the past, now again after more than a quarter of a century has transpired, and after a score and a half of years have gone by since he spoke who first laid the foundations of the Institution, it is again due on the part of another, that there should be a becoming response for the confidence reposed by those to whom belong the distribution of the offices of the College. But while there is, I trust, a proper sense of gratitude and appreciation, when I regard the ceremonies of this occasion as the official transaction connected with the full and formal

*Inaugural Address delivered June 9, 1875.

induction into the office to which I have been chosen, they are invested with no ordinary significance, and serve to impress with an overawing sense of the duties and the responsibilities which inseparably connect themselves with the presidency of such an institution of learning. And of these I may, in some measure at least, speak from observation and experience, afforded by the active duties of the office in the collegiate year now closing.

In the address which custom prescribes to this occasion it is due to the friends of the College that there should be a declaration of views, if not inclusive of the comprehensive subject, then at least upon some of the essential features of collegiate education, that they may have some assurance of the general method to be pursued in the attainment of the objects for which the institution in all its departments is being sustained.

In addressing you, however, upon the subject of education, I appreciate the fact, as no doubt you do also, that I am to speak upon a topic the length and breadth of which have been explored, and upon which things new and old have been presented and experiments made, from the beginning of the history of learning, even from the schools of the prophets of Israel to the present day. And if there may yet be something new spoken upon this subject, there must also, and almost of necessity, be much referred to which is old—old in theory and in practice—which yet finds its worth in the fact, that in the history of the intellectual development of the human race it has met the demand and stood the criticism, and maintained to the present its honorable position in the esteem of the largest number of eminent scholars and prominent educators in this and in other lands.

But the object of education, common-place as it is, has ever held the most conspicuous place in the thought and the literature of the day, and is a subject which will never be void of interest and importance, because it refers to that which reasons and feels and wills. It refers to that which is not controlled like a material substance, but to that which itself regulates and moves and controls, which takes the

helm into its own hand, and is therefore always a permanent and powerful factor in the affairs of men. It refers to that in the individual which cannot be set at naught, and for which nothing can be substituted, because the seal of immortality has been placed upon it. It pertains to the conquering mind which, like the restless sea, ever beats against the shore which bounds it. If in some of its elements it differs from the infinite and the ever-living soul, the culture of the human mind nevertheless has its bearing upon two states of being. It involves two worlds, and therefore whether from considerations pertaining to the pursuits of the life which now is or to that which is to come, that which belongs to the proper cultivation of the mental faculties becomes a subject of commanding importance.

In the contemplation of this subject, one cannot but enter into the spirit of the declaration of the old Prussian school officer, Dinter, who is quoted as saying, "I promised God that I would look upon every peasant child as a being who could complain of me, *before God*, did I not endeavor to provide for him the best education possible for me to provide." Such was a noble sentiment as well as the expression of a genuine sympathy and a true sense of obligation.

But if such was the consciousness of duty in relation to those who were to enter but the elementary departments of instruction, what must be the profound sense of accountability in regard to those who are no longer the mere spectators of the play of life, but who are being qualified to act their part as free, intellectual, moral and immortal beings, who in the future are to be "eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame;" who are to search out causes among men, and for men, which men know not, and to whom men will give ear, and upon whom men will wait, and keep silence at their counsel, and whose *judgment* shall be their badge of royalty and their robe of honor. These are now dismissed from the College in an age of strong conflict, an age which is going into history with its harvest of projects for civil, social, literary and ecclesiastical reforms. In such a juncture of human affairs, and standing face to face with a future fraught with

considerations paramount and vital to mankind, our plea and inquiry on this occasion must be for

THE COLLEGIATE EDUCATION WHICH IS ADAPTED TO THE WANTS
OF THE PRESENT DAY.

This inquiry naturally subdivides itself into two parts.

First, What is collegiate education in its true idea, abstractly considered? and, *Secondly*, What are the principal studies to be pursued, with other features of the education which is adapted to the special wants of the present times? While the term education, or the inquiry, what is it to be educated, is on the lips of almost every one, and no answer in the oldest catechism of the Church should be more stereotyped or familiar, yet upon this inquiry there are numerous and conflicting opinions, and these maintained with a fair show of reasoning by prominent writers and educators in this and other lands. Influences arising from various sources have produced this diversity of opinion and controversy. Among these we may refer to the following:

In the first place, the *want* of a collegiate education on the part of those who have sons and daughters to be educated, frequently prevents them from fully appreciating the advantages of such an education, and inclines them to the idea of limiting both the time and the means to procure a thorough intellectual training. Another reason for diversity of opinion on this subject, may be found on the part of those who are already pursuing a course of mental discipline. The indisposition of the mind to close and continued application to study, then the usual American haste, also applied to the acquisition of knowledge, have produced theories of education, which have been adopted by Colleges, seeking to meet the popular demand, rather than to impart to the student a thorough mental culture. And from financial necessity, and for the increase of students as a partial relief from it, some institutions have proceeded practically upon the idea that a system of education should commend itself to the student by its attractiveness, rather than by its thoroughness, by what it allows the student to omit rather than by what it obliges

him to pursue. And hence in some cases the popular Colleges and Seminaries have been those from which a diploma could be procured by the largest elective privileges and by the smallest amount of hard study.

The fundamental principles underlying a correct system of collegiate education have also been involved in obscurity by discussion and controversy—not so much in every case, it is to be feared, for the purpose of arriving at the truth on this subject as for the purpose of establishing rival institutions of learning, where if all had advocated the same theories of education, and adopted the same methods in the pursuit of it, there would hardly have already been an occasion, in our own country, for so large a number of Colleges as three hundred, or almost two score in the single State of Ohio—a statistical fact which allows no excuse for future ignorance, should there be any, but is a demand for general intelligence as also a fact setting forth a reason for the controversy of the past, as well as a flattering prospect for its continuation for a time yet to come. Then also the natural disposition to forsake that which is old, and follow that which is new; a discontent with what we have, yet without any definite idea of what we would have; the employment of the faculty for destruction, which is so common, but without the exercise of the talent for construction which is so rare; and the further mistaken idea that change necessarily is progress—these notions and influences have had much to do with such diversity of opinion. Another, and perhaps one of the principal agencies which has contributed to this spirit of controversy on the subject of education, is believed by some to have its origin in the political convulsions which have taken place within the past decade and a half of years in both hemispheres. These great national commotions may have produced in the minds of some the inclination, and in the minds of others the more decided determination, to re-open all important questions, whether belonging to the State, the Church, or to Colleges and Universities, and the demand of all these institutions, whether they are or are not constructed in harmony with the real or the supposed wants of the human

family, and in some cases to question even their right to an existence where they bar the path of some of the so-called modern social and educational reforms.

While we may be assured that the axe is not laid at the root of the old and well-established institutions of the State and the Church, yet the time may have come when these require some pruning; or to change the figure, the fan may be in the hand of Providence with which he will purge the floor, and gather the wheat; or the fire may be already kindled which will consume that which is but dross, and more fully purify and refine the gold. The time may be at hand when we must prove all things, and when we must with our might hold fast that which is good, in order that we may retain it at all. Who doubts the truth of the declaration that in His own time He will overturn, and overturn and overturn, whose right it is to reign, and that He will have more of His truth and image reflected from every institution which He has established for the well-being of the human family? That period may have its dawn already.

The true cause, however, and for which there is plausible argument as well as some show of reason, why our schools and colleges are in the midst of a revolution, is supposed to be found in the fact that on the one hand there has been the rapid as well as the extensive multiplication of subjects of knowledge through the progress of science, through the opening of wider fields of literature, and from a more critical investigation on all sides of the history of the earth and its inhabitants, while on the other hand is the equally increased range of industrial arts and occupations, to which it is also claimed that the higher education of the present day should be adapted.

On the one side or the other of these two theories educators are now ranging themselves. And the principal point involved in the controversy, as we apprehend it, is not whether there shall or shall not be scientific and industrial schools; places where special instruction shall be given relating to the mechanic arts and pursuits, but what prominence shall be given to these departments of study in the college

proper? How far shall the studies which necessarily belong to a course of instruction, worthy to be called collegiate, be displaced by a substitution of the studies referred to? How far shall the old idea and aim of the college yield to the "*new education*" so called? The old lays the principal stress upon the attainment of such a degree of mental development and discipline as shall prepare the student for any course of active life which he may subsequently choose, while the new undertakes the immediate preparation of the student for his intended occupation and makes the acquirement of mental discipline merely an incidental result of the studies to be pursued. The old method proposes first to discipline the mind, and then to teach it to apply its powers; the new proposes to do both at once. It is said in illustration of the one that he who expects to be a civil engineer, should study engineering, and should waste no time on Latin and Greek. He who is to be a Professor of Mining should acquaint himself with Geology, Mineralogy and Metallurgy, but should ignore Mathematics, Mental Science and Literature. And as to Law, Medicine and Theology, the inference would be from the new theory, that such studies only, should be pursued as contribute directly to the pursuit of these professions; and that the usual diploma from a literary institution is not essential to an admittance to the Theological Seminary, the Law School, or to the Medical College.

Mental, just as manual, labor, it is claimed, should be turned to immediate account, the aim of life being to make "a good living," so called. And hence when Lord Brougham, a half century ago, declared that he hoped the time would come in England when every man would be able to *read* Bacon, Wm. Cobbett replied, that he would be contented if the time even came in England, when every man would be able to *eat* bacon.

It is not the province of the college to make its students merchants, mechanics, and manufacturers and farmers. The practical knowledge of these callings must be gained from practical men in the shops, the ware-rooms and the fields; and where such is the ultimate end of collegiate edu-

education the student may become "Baccalaureum Artis," but it does not legitimately admit him "ad gradum baccalaureum artium." This may be admitted, however, says one on this point in the subject, that as science aids art and perfects it, so a college by teaching the sciences may fit its students, not it may be for their ordinary avocations, but the different branches being admitted into the course of instruction and taught as sciences abstractly considered, or in a literary and an academic spirit, it may be allowable for the student to give not neglect to any, but a preference to those studies which may assist him in professional pursuits. And, as it has been further written in explanation of the thought: "Those who are intended for Theology might legitimately and properly show a partiality for the languages of the Old and New Testaments, and for the truths of Mental Philosophy, which bring them into such intimate relation with the great truths of religion; and a medical student might draw lovingly to chemistry and physiology; while the lawyer in prospect, might give less attention to other subjects, and more special study to political science, occupying his spare moments with the Federalist, Blackstone, or Kent."

This is in entire harmony with the idea of collegiate education, the province of which is to train all the powers, but always adopting the method which is the best fitted to elevate and strengthen and refine, all the mental and the moral faculties. And we are glad to record also, that the opinion is growing that the intellectual power acquired by a thorough course of education can be transmitted into a force which will infuse intelligence and crown with success and a no less but even greater competency every department of the useful and noble and honorable industries of life. And it is furthermore gratifying that the sentiment is increasing, and which the present times may yet render quite popular, and which if labor is a *blessing*, as it is claimed, then the few have no right to make a monopoly of it, and if it is a *curse*, as it is also maintained, then the few have no right to bear it for the many, but that every able bodied and every able minded man and woman in the land should be engaged in that which is

honorable and useful to themselves and to their fellow men. Respect and patience are on the decline, as they should be, for that class of mere idle consumers who rob others for a living by leading an aimless, useless life themselves, and who, as if they were either idiots or children, must be supported by the mental or the manual toil, or both, of others, no more able to toil than they themselves are.

For this, I trust, pardonable digression from the principal thought in hand, we return to say, that there should be no controversy on the subject as to what higher collegiate education is in its true idea, for the reason that there are certain leading principles and well defined laws of the mind which must determine the true theory and methods and the extent of such education.

Man is composed of a three-fold nature, all in an imperfect state of development—the physical, mental and the moral. The Creator, no doubt, intends that these shall be perfect in the end, but he has not seen fit to make them perfect in the beginning, but has left room for growth; and it is a part of the task laid upon His intelligent creatures that they should be fellow-workers with Him in improving and perfecting that which he so wisely has left in that incompleted state.

These three natures combined constitute but one being. And as they are separate and distinct, so also must the methods to be employed in their improvement, be as diverse in their nature as the natures themselves, for there must be an adaptation. That method of training which will develop herculean power and activity in the physical, may still leave the intellectual in a state of infancy or imbecility. And when the strength and beauty of the mental may charm and command the highest admiration, there may yet be much pertaining to the moral which is defective and reprehensible. And these three natures, therefore, require three distinct subjects or objects for their development. That which is material is adapted to the physical, truth and thought are adapted to the mental, and the truth and the influences of the Spirit

combined must be employed for the development of the truly moral and spiritual.

And hence, the first principle in education is that the complete and perfect knowledge of the subject to be educated, must determine the methods to be employed for its education. And hence, also, the deepest and truest philosophy of the human mind can alone determine the true theory for its cultivation. What are its qualities, its methods of growth, and its possibilities?

Here again, in harmony with the great law of life, the process begins within, and acts towards that which is without. It is not the gathering up of knowledge from wide and diversified sources, and then applying it to or placing it upon the mind, but it is the going out of the life and activity of the mind itself in its search for and self-application to the truth. It is the *laying hold upon and the patient holding on, to the problem, the principle or the subject in an exercise, which gives warmth and glow, and perspiration, and muscle to the brain*, in a word, endurance to that which is the motive power for thought and mental activity. It is not the play with balls and bats and ladders and ropes and swinging bars. It is not the race of boats plied with oars, and with heated controversy whether there shall be thirty strokes per minute or more, but it is the rigid drill with truth, the persistent and heated gymnastics with intricate questions and difficult problems. Both are *education*—but the one is for the *brawn*, while the other is for the *brain*. The former is a prominent feature of the superficial “new,” while the other pertains to the sound old education.

The inquiry: “Is truth or is the pursuit of the truth the superior end, in a correct system of education?” has been termed the curious *theoretical* question and at the same time the most important practical problem within the whole compass of philosophy, since, according to its solution, do we determine the aim and regulate the method which an enlightened science of education must adopt. Plato defines man not the possessor of, but “the hunter of truth.

"The intellect is perfected," says Aristotle, "not by knowledge but by exercise."

Another says, "*Tantum sit homo quantum operatur*," a man's knowledge is measured by his activity.

"If," says Malebranche, "I held truth *captive in my hand*, I should open my hand and let it fly, in order that I might pursue it and capture it again." Says Lessing: "Did the Almighty, holding in his right hand truth, and in his left hand search after truth, deign to tender me the one I might prefer, in all humility, but without hesitation, I would request search after the truth."

"Truth," says Von Müller, "is the property of God, pursuit of truth is what belongs to man;" and Paul Richter: "Tis not the goal but the course which makes us happy." And in illustration and enforcement of the same thought writes Sir Wm. Hamilton: "Self activity is the indispensable condition of improvement; and education is only education, that is, it accomplishes its purpose only by affording objects and supplying incitements to the spontaneous exertion of the mind; and strictly speaking every one must educate himself; and hence also the instructor can declare, *ὄν φιλοσοφία ἀλλὰ φιλοσοφεῖν*, I do not teach philosophy, but how to philosophise.

Let this suffice to illustrate the truth that the superior aim and end of collegiate education, abstractly considered, is not the accumulation of knowledge, but that it is the drawing out and the unfolding and strengthening of the faculties of the mind. An old truth, so regarded perhaps, but a truth nevertheless liable to be obscured and set aside by the spirit of haste and superficiality, a contagion with which some modern systems of education are afflicted. But such being the superior aim and end of development, what shall be the extent of it, or how comprehensive in relation to the mental faculties, shall that development be so that it may be in harmony with the true idea of the college or of collegiate education?

In order to the perfection of manhood, the grosser elements of his nature must be cultivated as well as those more re-

fined. And from the culture of the one may be found the analogy to guide in the culture of the other. All are ready to admit that a judicious system of physical training must aim at the most perfect development of all the organs which in any way may call out the sources of power which belong to man's bodily structure. Nothing should be omitted which will contribute to the strength, symmetry and activity, as well as the healthful beauty of the material frame. "It would be a blunder," says one, "if in this moulding process, by the narrowness of their theory, parents and teachers should bestow all their formative labor upon a single limb or upon a particular set of muscles. Were we to see a parent endeavoring by such arts to induce a large development of the right arm because his son was destined to wield a sledge hammer, or to cultivate the curvature of the spine because he was to follow the plow, but be unmindful of the superior claims of the general symmetry of the human frame, such physical training would strike one as the height of absurdity; and yet such is the absurdity to which there is a strong tendency in the mental discipline of the present day." So may we also find an illustration of our thought in the moral or the spiritual element of our nature. And here again the argument is against that which is but partial. There is no mingling there of strength in one part and weakness in another—defect in this faculty and perfection in that.

The apostle Paul does not describe the tree of the Spirit bearing love here and hatred there, faith on one branch and unbelief on the other, vice with its unsightly and bitter fruit suspended from one limb, and virtue with its excellence and beauty blooming upon another; there is no such grafting and cultivation as that for the production of a perfect moral character, but the improving influences of the Spirit must lay hold upon and develop and discipline and refine not a part only, but all the moral faculties, then that symmetrical and harmonious development we call *the perfect man*.

Such would be the true idea of education morally considered, and that theory which would leave a part untouched and uncultivated would be regarded defective in so far.

Now, what is true of the physical and the moral, must necessarily also be true of the mental, in man's nature. If all the organs of the body must be included in a process of training and development in order that there may be the perfect human frame; and if all the faculties of the moral nature must be comprehended in order that there may be a perfect moral character, must not all the faculties of the mind be included also in a process of discipline and culture, in order that the result may be what is termed, and in the true sense, an educated man. Not that the faculties of the mind have attained a full or even a like degree of development, but the student has passed through a course of study which has been arranged with a view to general cultivation; and also adapting important branches of study, both as to length of time and number of text books, to the prominent faculties of the mind.

The curriculum of our Colleges is not merely experimental but it is historic. When we seek for the origin of the classical part of it, we find that it has come down to us through almost thirty centuries, beginning with Homer, then to those whose writings in a golden age of literature were confined to the highest and the purest models in their language. The Latin classical period, though shorter, opened with Plautus, who so refined the language of the Romans that at the time it was said in praise of it, that if the Muses were to speak in the Latin tongue, they would employ the diction of Plautus. The ancient tongues were enthroned in all the earlier schools of liberal education throughout Italy, Spain, France, Germany and England. They open to us the great treasures of the thought of the preceding ages, when our own language was yet for centuries unknown. "If any one wishes," wrote Hegius, "to understand grammar, rhetoric, mathematics, history, or the Holy Scriptures, let him learn Greek." "We owe everything to the Greeks," he writes. And it is said that with like enthusiasm Lange exclaimed: "Now is the time at hand when darkness shall be driven from the land and sound doctrine shall return to our churches, and pure Latin shall be taught in our schools." "As we hold the

Gospel dear," says Luther, "so also let us hold the language fast, for if we do not keep the tongues we shall not keep the Gospel." We call them *dead* languages, and so they seem at first, for as we dissect them they lie passive that we may get a complete analysis and biography of them, like the body under the dissecting hand and knife of the anatomist. But yet enter into the life and spirit of them really, going beyond that which is mere skeleton, and you still listen to the historian, to the poet, the orator, the philosopher, you still hear the tread of the Grecian phalanx and behold the stately march of the Roman legion, and though dead as we call them, yet we exclaim with others, "see they have only put off flesh and blood to put on immortality." How steadily have they maintained their place in the complete college curriculum, both from their fine disciplinary effect upon the mind and also because they are the noble ancestry from which have sprung other tongues, and much of our own noble English. Writes one, prominent as an educator in one of the best of our Ohio Colleges: "Those who contemplate the so-called learned professions, cannot forego a knowledge of the ancient classics without loss. A philosopher shut out from the old Greek giants, a physician unable to hold converse with Hippocrates and Galen, a jurist ignorant among the tomes of Roman law, a theologian who cannot examine the divine oracles in the words and sentences in which God gave them, may be efficient and useful men, but their culture has not been fully reached and perfected, nor can it be until they may freely approach and drink from those old and ever exhilarating springs and fountains of professional lore." And so also and none the less earnestly may the mathematics be commended. Says Dr. McCosh, though the profound and enthusiastic metaphysician: "Over the gates of every College I would write what is said to have been inscribed over the academy in which Plato taught—'*Let no one enter here who is without geometry.*'" The mathematics reveal to the mind that there is self-evident truth. They establish the existence of necessary principles. Then continues the same writer in the following striking presentation of their value morally as well

as intellectually considered, an element in them rarely ever contemplated: "That they establish the existence of necessary truth is a very important conviction to have fixed in the minds of young men, especially in these times, when an attempt is made to derive all certainty from experience, which must ever be limited, and can never, any more than a stream can rise above its fountain, establish a universal necessary proposition. And having seen that there are *a priori* truths in mathematics, the mind will be better prepared to admit that there are eternal and unchangeable principles lying at the basis of morality and religion and guaranteeing to us the immutable character of the Law and the justice of God."

And closely allied to this branch of study, and for the preparation of the faculties of the mind for the most patient and penetrating efforts in its search for the truth, is the study of the mental sciences—the intellectual and the moral—that branch of study which not only braces the mind for the most vigorous and prolonged effort, but that also which imparts to it its greatest flexibility; the power to turn itself from its so much accustomed observation and investigation of the more external objects, to the investigation of itself; to the investigation of that which itself thinks and reasons. The study therefore which opens the door of the inner temple of the student's own immortal nature and reveals himself to himself as a thinking conscious intelligence. The branch of study which sets forth the reason of things rather than the art or use of them. The wisest saying of one of the ancient philosophers, was, "know thyself;" and this branch of study alone enables the student to solve that problem. And to the saying, "know thyself," may also be added "that thou mayest know thy God"—for that ignorance of self is ignorance of God, is a truth proclaimed by Jew and Gentile, by the Christian and the Mohammedan; for we believe in God not by reason of nature lastly, but we believe in God by reason of the supernatural which reveals Him to us and proves Him to exist. It is a science and a study also which incontrovertibly proves human liberty, and as firmly establishes personal responsibility, and therefore in addition to its being

the best study for thorough mental discipline, it is also the best aid and the truest preparation to the acquirement of an enlightened Christian theology. Such a branch of study in the college curriculum cannot be too highly esteemed nor too faithfully pursued. And may it continue to crown the crowning year of the college course, and if possible have a prominent position in the branches taught in the Wittenberg of the future as in the Wittenberg of the past.

And perhaps also there has never been, no, we will not say perhaps, but without any qualifying terms, we will say that there never has been a period in the history of the Colleges which have been established upon moral and Christian principles, when the *natural sciences* have demanded so much attention as at the present time. This vast department of learning which we call nature, but which is but the art of Him whose glory the heavens declare and who is the maker and builder of all, when there is no other object before the mind but to open this book reverently because of Him who is its author, and gather the vast stores of knowledge from pages which are as deep as our earth and broad as the universe, even then must afford profound interest and delight to the human mind. But how vastly is this study enhanced in moral as in intellectual importance where the attempt is made to array its theories, its facts and its conclusions, against divine revelation and the Christian religion. And the issue must now be accepted by the believer. While a withdrawal from this special field of controversy would not necessarily be an acknowledgment of defeat on his part, yet such would be the general interpretation against him. And in consideration of the large number of young men and young women in our Colleges and our Seminaries, who attend to this branch of study, and also from the effort to popularize it for the general reader among the masses of the people, who will not lead their minds up through nature to nature's God—from these and other considerations this does become a subject not alone of profound interest, but one involving a large measure of moral obligation on the part of those who in their teaching can and will give to science the

things that are faith's. And here as an educator he must not be driven from his legitimate position; for, in truth, there can be no conflict between the teachings of science and those of revelation, any more than there can be between the right eye and the left, or the right hand and the left. Every note in the song of the spheres, when properly understood, will be in perfect harmony with the song of Moses and the Lamb. And while science proclaims: "Great and marvelous are thy works, O Lord," revelation responds: "Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints."

We would yet speak of the superior claims of the English language in a complete course of instruction, but impelled by being reminded that the hour is passing, we with reluctance leave other interesting topics; yet to remark, however, that while the mission of the College, in its true idea, is to afford a course of study which will give general and thorough discipline to all the faculties of the mind, touching the whole range of liberal studies, from that which is the most highly æsthetical to those the most profoundly scientific and philosophical, involving the sound and standard features and the principal studies which have been referred to, and which give the course of instruction its true academic spirit and its intellectual adaptation to the times, there are yet several other important features necessarily connected with the collegiate education which is fully adapted to the wants of the present day.

An important element in a system of education is the cultivation of the love of the institutions of government under which we live. As we have our respective states, and these have their rights and interests and institutions peculiar to their various or individual wants, it is highly probable that there would be some state pride, yet beyond these considerations there is yet a national and broader government which must also command our sympathies and our support. And so also with a true system of collegiate education. That may possess all the elements and methods which render it an efficient agency for the cultivation of the faculties of

the mind; it may support morality and the Christian Church; yet with all the excellencies of such culture a true American system of education must also possess that element which will cultivate a spirit broader than these, and develop a hearty sympathy for the laws, the language and the institutions of the country at large, in which we live. While every system of education should aim to make the thorough scholar, it should none the less aim to make the upright and the loyal citizen, the lover of his country. And here we find that especially which commends young men to seek at least the larger part of their education in the institutions of their own land. The United States as a nation is the "Eldorado and the Alabama of the world;" and in consequence has a marked and distinct character to work out for herself. Her institutions, her arts, her aims, her hopes are all her own. She is working out her own destiny while other nations are the interested spectators of the results.

To preserve the life and character of this nation, and advance its institutions with those of the Christian religion, is the province of our system of education. Says Dr. Smith of Dartmouth College, on the subject of education abroad: "I approve fully and heartily the view that on intellectual, moral and patriotic grounds, the American youth should be educated at home. It is contrary to the fundamental laws of culture to send them abroad to be educated. To reverse a Scripture figure, it is like sewing old cloth into a new garment. It lays foreign foundations for what should be an American edifice. It forms or is apt to form a double character, with a mixture of old world and new world associations. And there are also moral dangers connected with it still more momentous. The Christian parent sends his child with an anxious heart to a boarding school or College even in this country, notwithstanding all the Christian influences that surround the latter, above the average of the general community. Must it not seem therefore like inviting his ruin to send him so far away from home influence, from the land of revivals of the Christian religion, from institutions

of learning founded in prayer, to a land where revivals are almost unknown, where the holy Sabbath is a holiday, where infidelity is bolder than in any other land, where vice goes in the garb of virtue, a land of which the distinguished Christlieb himself must write with sorrow, that ninety-eight per cent. of the population do not attend the church services!" And as he still further writes: "where all the factors of our intellectual life are largely influenced by a prevailing spirit of unbelief. In our gymnasia and other grammar schools religious instruction is, with some praiseworthy exceptions, relegated to a very inferior position. And it was discovered not long since that in a Prussian gymnasium a secret society existed among the boys from thirteen to fifteen years of age, with rules of a purely atheistic character, the first one commencing with: 'Any one believing in God is *thereby* excluded from this society.' And such being the condition of our Grammar schools who can wonder that at the University few students but those reading theology should go to church, while many lecturers allow themselves to hold such language on the subject as to lead their audience to regard attendance upon public worship as something quite beneath their dignity."

This leads me to another feature of the collegiate education which is adapted to present wants—the moral element. And when it is replied that it is not popular to introduce the moral element into the pursuit of classical and mathematical and scientific truth, we may reply that the same difficulty has always been encountered by the Decalogue, the Golden Rule, with other principles and truths of the Gospel. Men have not been prepared for them, and hence they have been wanting in popularity. And they will never become prepared for them by the neglect of them, but by their use. And notwithstanding the opinion of some to the contrary, it can nevertheless be shown that the adoption and the practice of the fundamental principles of morality and those of general Christianity, instead of disqualifying, *qualify* the mind for the search and acquisition of the truth. The moral element surely takes away none of the scientific interest or pleasure, but it also

adds the stronger sense of personal obligation, through the perception that all truth sustains an intimate relation to a personal Deity. And the moral nature in man also demands this development, side by side and year by year, with the intellectual; and "what God hath joined together let no man put asunder." And that knowledge which is without love to God, and destitute of faith in his Son, will in the end prove to have been but a curse to the mind and the greater damnation to the soul; and the promoters of such an education must also sooner or later hear and see and bear the fatal consequences of it. From their followers will come the charge: 'when I asked you for bread you gave me a stone, and worse still, when I asked you for a fish you gave me a serpent. I came to you for the enlightenment of the mind and for the knowledge of the truth in its purity, but instead of that you have poisoned the mind against the truth, and instead of light have consigned it to the blackness of darkness forever. In the world a sinner, but, not enough, the false principles you inculcated have made me an unbeliever in Christ, and have put me in arms against the Almighty God. To a natural depravity you have added a pernicious education. It was not enough that my *life* should be a contradiction and a failure, but you have exposed me to the consequences which follow the denial of the truth after *death*. You have bequeathed to me a fatal inheritance; and instead of the esteem and the gratitude which is due to him who endeavors faithfully to direct the mind in the path of truth and duty I will now become your tormentor, a frightful spectacle before your eyes, and for my misery and despair will pour into your ears reproach through all eternity.'

To systems of education or to literary institutions where the moral and intellectual are divorced one from the other, we would say: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit," and "Ye must be born again." On this particular feature of the subject, the Hon., as also the wise, E. D. Mansfield, writes: "The common idea of establishing state institutions or those of unsectarian influences, is proving a failure. There are now about three

hundred institutions in this country, called colleges or universities, professing to give a classic and a scientific education. Of these, thirty are State institutions, and of which the majority have received large endowments from the government in lands; and only two of the whole number, the University of Virginia and the University of Michigan are at all important. Most of them are utter failures, and so are most of those unsectarian." Then he writes: "*The great institutions are upheld by positive religious influences.*" And while such are the facts now, they are but in perfect harmony with the history of the higher educational institutions in all the ages past. They have been founded and nurtured by Christianity. It is a notable fact, but it is the natural and the logical result of the command of Him who said to his disciples, *Go YE and teach all nations.* And hence all along the stream of centuries, the bearer of light to mankind has not been skepticism, but *faith*. Secular literature and speculative science, as well as sacred learning, have had their life, impulse, and their means of support chiefly in connection with the influences of the Christian religion. So that it would at least be but fair and manly on the part of those who would so widely separate the moral from the intellectual in all the schools and colleges for higher education, that while they have been benefitted and enriched, they should not aim to destroy the hand that enriched them. While they claim, though mistaken, "to have found the golden egg, they should not destroy the bird that laid it."

While there are yet other important and inviting features of this subject, I will not tax your kind attention and patience further than to make but the briefest statement of a few of them.

Our observation on the subject of the co-education of the sexes, is not sufficiently extended to warrant the attempt to speak advisedly. But from the opportunities afforded in a limited manner in the College in the past year, I am prepared to say without hesitation, from the progress made by the ladies and gentlemen in their studies, and from the generally beneficial influences which have accrued to both sexes by

their meeting in the class-rooms for recitation, that with the proper accommodation in the way of buildings, and which are also becoming imperatively necessary to the institution in regard to its other interests as well, we believe the system of co-education would also be as gratifying to the friends and patrons of Wittenberg College as it seems to be elsewhere, where there has been, from both time and facilities, the opportunity to give the subject a fair trial.

In regard to the Colleges of Ohio, a State ranking third in population in the Union, and not of any less rank in wealth and enterprise, the time has fully come, when, from the general liberality of her citizens in regard to enterprises of a material nature, her institutions of learning should now also be largely endowed, and equipped throughout, and with such accommodations in the way of buildings, that no young man or woman should be obliged to go far from home—and especially away to the East, so-called, when we occupy the very centre of the East in this continent—in order to enter a regular and first-class College, or to attend schools or departments established for instruction in special branches of study. And when we are asked when such departments will be opened in connection with Wittenberg College, we reply that the object will be to keep abreast with every useful improvement, and meet every reasonable demand of the times as rapidly as the College has the financial ability so to do. And we trust that her friends in Springfield, as elsewhere, will appreciate the fact, that with the advancement of general education on the part of all the people, there are demands made upon the College for increased facilities, as well as for the elevation of the standard of education; but for the accomplishment of which increased financial ability is also required.

The College, then, in its true ambition and idea, should aim to send forth a body of educated men, who as ministers or lawyers or physicians or private gentlemen, or engaged in the industrial and business departments of life, would, from their intellectual character and refinement, spread around them an intellectually refining influence among all their fellow men. And especially in view of the elevated

standard of education in the common schools—and crushed be the hand that raises itself for *their* destruction—the standard of the Colleges must also, and in the same ratio, be advanced, lest the distinction between the college and the public high school be obliterated. Our colleges in their relation to lower education should rise like towers and lofty steeples out of our towns and cities, and they should lift themselves up like hills and mountains from out of the plains. As it is said of Athens and of Alexandria of ancient times, so still should the college be a moral and an intellectual metropolis whence elevating influences go down to all the provinces. And I would inscribe over the entrance to the college: “Character before culture, and culture before knowledge;” and also that other memorable declaration: “It is not important that this should be a school of three hundred students, or of one hundred, or of fifty students, but it is important that it should be a school of Christian gentlemen and ladies who are students in spirit and application.”

ARTICLE VIII.

GENERAL SYNOD.

Several circumstances prevented a suitable notice of the last meeting of our General Synod from appearing in the July number of the REVIEW. It is proposed to furnish such a notice in this number.

The *twenty-seventh* convention of the General Synod assembled in St. Mark's Lutheran Church, Baltimore, Md., Wednesday, May 26th, 1875. It was thirty-two years since that body had met in the monumental city, and this meeting was looked forward to with much interest. It was by reason of a failure to meet in the place selected, and a cordial invitation from the Baltimore churches, that it met in that city. In earlier years, the General Synod had several times met there, and Baltimore had from the beginning been one of the centres of General Synod Lutheranism. The Synod of Mary-

land had taken a prominent part in the organization of the General Synod, and has always yielded it a generous and cordial support. The first three meetings were held within its bounds, and nearly half of all its conventions—eleven out of twenty-seven—have been held on its territory. It was fitting that the General Synod should again meet where it did, and that old associations and recollections should be revived.

When the General Synod last met in Baltimore, in 1843, there was but one English Lutheran Church of any strength in that city. Some new enterprises were in their infancy, and struggling for existence. Now we can present quite an array of active and growing churches. Besides the mother church, which has changed its location, and just dedicated its magnificent temple, the second church in Lombard street, the third in Monument, St. Mark's, and St. Paul's, with several large and flourishing German churches, show the growth of Evangelical Lutheranism in this city. No other city in the Union can boast an equal number of Lutheran churches belonging to the General Synod.

In consequence of the protracted strength from protracted sickness of the President, Rev. Dr. Baum, the Secretary, Rev. Prof. S. A. Ort, preached the synodical sermon. The discourse was based on Nehemiah 4:19, "*And I said unto the nobles, and to the rulers, and to the rest of the people, The work is great and large, and we are separated upon the wall, one far from another.*"

The number of District Synods embraced in the General Synod is twenty-three, three of which were formally received at this meeting. These three Synods then received respectively represent three different languages, English, German and Swedish. It is a matter of gratification to find these different nationalities seeking a home in the General Synod. The number of members on the roll constituting the General Synod was 162, most of whom answered to their names. Besides these, officers of Boards, visiting ministers, and active laymen, who attended, swelled the number to at least 100 more, making it one of the largest representative bodies of Lutherans ever assembled in this country.

The organization was effected by the election of Rev. G. F. Stelling, D. D., as President, Rev. Prof. S. A. Ort, Secretary, and A. F. Ockershausen, Esq., Treasurer. The business meetings were held in St. Mark's, but the anniversaries of the several societies and other public meetings were distributed among the different churches. On the first evening a devotional meeting was held in the *First Church*, Rev. J. H. Barclay, pastor. The subject for discussion was: "The best method of developing the efficiency of lay-work in our congregations." The attendance was large and the meeting one of deep interest. Several addresses were made, and the impression deepened that the whole church has work to do.

As by the standing rules of the General Synod, the business of the several Church Boards and societies is taken up in order immediately after the reading of the minutes at the morning sessions, and as this occupies a large part of the time and attention of the General Synod, it will probably be the simplest and best plan first to furnish a brief summary of the several interests thus represented.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The General Synod has assigned the first place to the cause of Foreign Missions, and the report presented was highly gratifying. Fears had been entertained that there would be serious embarrassment in the treasury of this Board—but these fears were all dispelled by the report of the treasurer. The total expenditures during the two years covered by the report were \$29,167.09. The number of laborers engaged in the Mission work was reported as follows: Seven ordained ministers, four female missionaries, teachers, colporteurs and evangelists, sixty-six, making a sum total of seventy-seven. The report of the secretary says: "Our working force has been increased. The vantage ground occupied two years ago has been retained, and amid great financial struggles at home, new fields have been occupied abroad."

The Missions of the General Synod are in India and Africa, and in both countries encouraging success has attended the

Vol. V. No. 4. 75

labors of the devoted missionaries. We regret the absence of full statistical reports, but are gratified by the assurance of steady progress in the work. A very promising opening in Japan led to the passage of the following resolution:

“Resolved, That in view of the favorable indications of Providence, the Board of Foreign Missions be instructed to take the preliminary steps for the establishment of a mission in Tokio, the capital of Japan, at the earliest practicable period.”

The anniversary of the Board was held in the Second Lutheran Church, Lombard St., on Thursday evening, when several addresses were delivered.

The work of Foreign Missions is growing on our hands and calls loudly for increased liberality in our contributions.

HOME MISSIONS.

Since the consolidation of our Home Missionary work in the General Synod, it has been steadily advancing and permanent results are being accomplished. The report of the Secretary showed that amid many difficulties the cause is making progress. During the two years, fourteen new missions have been added to the number already under the care of the Board, making the whole number fifty-three. These missions are distributed as follows: In Kansas, 8; Missouri, 2; Nebraska, 1; Iowa, 6; Illinois, 4; Indiana, 2; Michigan, 1; Ohio, 7; Kentucky, 1; West Virginia, 3; Pennsylvania, 8; New York, 5; Massachusetts, 2; Maine, 1; District of Columbia, 1. The results of the work in this field are given thus: Accessions by confirmation, 562; accessions by baptism and profession, 471; accessions by certificate, 511; whole number of accessions, 1,544; number of losses, 503; net gain of membership, 1,041; infant baptism, 759; catechumens, 1,611; Parsonages built, 3; houses of worship built, 7; houses of worship bought, 2; houses of worship finished, 5; whole number of houses of worship secured, 14.

The amount received by the Board was \$26,227.27. In view of the importance of the work it was resolved that

twenty thousand dollars be raised annually for Home Missions.

The German Board of Home Missions presented its first biennial report, showing an additional work accomplished in this field. About half a dozen have received aid and about one thousand dollars were contributed for this department of Home Missionary work.

The anniversary of the Home Missionary Board was held in the Third Lutheran Church, Monument St., on Friday evening, with the usual addresses.

The Lutheran Church has an abundant field for Home Missions. It is only limited by the Church's ability and willingness to occupy the many and important openings. There is and should be no conflict between different interests in the work of the Church. Each has its place and all are important. But the work of Home Missions at the present time, and in the present aspect of things in our church, has a degree of importance that cannot well be over estimated. No Protestant Church in the land has such an opportunity for giving the gospel to multitudes who need it, and to none is the call louder to renewed activity and zeal in the work of evangelizing our home population.

CHURCH EXTENSION.

The interests of the Board of Church Extension are almost identical with those of Home Missions, and the management of them has been entrusted to the same persons, although the Boards are separate and distinct. The Treasurer's report shows that the amount of \$27,982.16 was received, a part of it however borrowed, and \$28,438.87 disbursed. The nett assets of the Board are \$20,284.29. During the two years a number of churches received aid, enabling them to secure places of worship, where otherwise it would have been impracticable for them to accomplish what they have done. Some of the most successful of our Home Missions are indebted to the aid received from this Board for their present measure of prosperity. We do not wish to mention individual cases, but the report, after mentioning one very en-

couraging case, adds, "The Board should be able to report many like it."

PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

The report of the Board of Publication furnished an exhibit of what had been accomplished during the twenty years of the existence of the Society. The Society has had to struggle with financial difficulties, but is gradually growing in efficiency and swelling its assets. According to the report the assets, exclusive of the Publication House, are \$41,478.97. The value of the House added, deducting a mortgage, would make the entire assets about \$50,000. The Board is doing what it can to furnish a denominational literature. Besides a number of works published, the Board publishes the General Synod's Book of Worship, Luther's Catechism, Sunday School Herald, Augsburg Sunday School Teacher, etc. This last named publication was presented to the Board by Rev. Dr. Conrad, at this meeting of the General Synod. The Board of Publication is engaged in a good work, and with increased funds could greatly enlarge its usefulness. The anniversary of the Society was held on Monday evening, May 31st, in St. Paul's Church. Several addresses were delivered.

HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

The Curator's report showed considerable activity in collecting the literature of the Church. Quite a number of bound volumes, and a still larger number of pamphlets, printed and manuscript, have been added to the collection. Suitable action was taken in reference to the death of the Rev. S. S. Schmucker, D. D., who had been President of the Society from its organization, in 1843, until the time of his call to the church above. The anniversary of the Society was held in St. Mark's Church, on Saturday evening, when an address was delivered by the Rev. M. Sheeleigh—subject: "Conservation of our Church's History." Rev. S. Sprecher, D. D., LL. D., was elected as speaker for the next meeting, with Rev. I. Magee, D. D., alternate.

The *Parent Education*, and the *Pastors' Fund* Societies transacted their business. The former now has little more than

a nominal existence, the work of beneficiary education being in the hands of the District Synods: the latter is growing into more importance. Its assets are \$6,194, and it was resolved to have the Society incorporated.

The topics which elicited the warmest discussion, and upon which there was most diversity of sentiment, were the revised Constitution for District Synods and the proposed Colloquium.

Two points in the Constitution for Synods elicited animated debate—the power of Synods over congregations, and the rights of the Ministerium. The first point was presented in the following provision: “It [Synod] shall have power to exclude from Synodical fellowship any congregation obstinately refusing to comply with the regulations and decisions of Synod, and no congregation thus excluded shall be served by any minister belonging to Synod, except by special permission of Synod or of the President of Synod.”

It was maintained on the one side that Synod had no right to forbid a minister to preach to a congregation, and whilst it might exclude a congregation from Synod, it was transcending its authority to refuse such a congregation the means of grace. The rights of congregations and the danger of undue Synodical authority were urged against this section of the Constitution. On the other side it was argued that such authority was necessary to the very safe existence of a Synod and good order among the churches; and that it was simply exercising jurisdiction over its own members. The Synod could not forbid an excluded congregation from having the means of grace, but it could forbid the supply of these means by its own members. It should not encourage contumacy or rebellion among the churches of the Synod. The section was adopted.

The debate on a section added to the article on the Ministerium was the most protracted during the meeting of the General Synod. It was not a question of Ministerium or no Ministerium. The Ministerium itself was not distinctly the point at issue, but the discussion took a pretty wide range. The Constitution as revised by the Committee contained the

article on the Ministerium, which was adopted without objection or a dissenting vote. One Synod had requested, through its delegates, the General Synod to affirm its position in regard to the Ministerium or to abolish it. The General Synod affirmed its position by adopting the article with the first section as follows:

"The Ministerium is composed of the ordained ministers of Synod, and shall have charge of the examination of candidates, licensure and ordination of ministers, reception of ministers from other ecclesiastical bodies, and the examination and decision of charges of heresy against any of its own members."

After adopting the entire article of thirteen sections as reported, the following additional section was proposed:

"In all cases where District Synods have not made provision for a Ministerium, all the powers and duties prescribed in this article shall devolve on the Synod."

It was on this section that the whole debate occurred. It was professedly offered to meet the case of Synods that might not have a separate Ministerium, and to furnish a constitution that all could adopt. No attempt will be here made to present the arguments on either side in detail, or to discuss anew the question. It was argued in general, on the one side, that the laity had a right to participate in the transaction of all ecclesiastical business, and that the Ministerium savored of a hierarchy. On the other side was urged the uniform practice of the Lutheran Church from the very beginning, the voice of her distinguished theologians, and the testimony of the General Synod for half a century. The Constitution for District Synods as prepared by the General Synod, published in innumerable copies of her Hymn Book and Book of Worship, adopted by many Synods, had expressly declared, that the duties of 'Examination, Licensure and Ordination of candidates for the ministry had been enjoined by Christ and his apostles upon ministers alone.' If this be true, it was argued that no Synod had a right to alter or abolish a divine institution. On a call for the Ayes and Noes the section was adopted by a vote of 67 to 55. It must be confessed that this action of

the General Synod leaves the matter in a very indefinite shape, and can hardly be satisfactory to either side. The General Synod has endorsed the Ministerium by adopting an article on the subject, declaring that it "shall have charge of " the examination of candidates, licensure and ordination of " ministers, reception of ministers from other ecclesiastical " bodies, and the examination and decision of charges of heresy against any of its own members." But, it has added a section providing for the exercise of "all the powers and duties prescribed in this article" by a Synod, where no Ministerium exists. Already the working of this is seen. While one Synod is reported as having abolished the Ministerium, another, among our oldest Synods, has endorsed the action of its delegates "in voting to sustain the polity and usage of " the Church of our fathers in reference to the Ministerium," and "earnestly requests the General Synod to reconsider its " late action on the subject." It is claimed on the one side that the General Synod has made a Ministerium the regular order and rule of the Church, and only provided for exceptional cases; but on the other, that it is now left an optional matter. One thing is plain, the agitation has resulted in unsettling and distracting the Church; and the General Synod is placed in a very awkward position, if this action contradicts her solemn printed testimony for half a century. It is highly probable that the subject will cause continued discussion, and before the long settled polity of the Church undergoes such a change, it should be conclusively shown that our fathers were in error in interpreting the word of God, and that our ecclesiastical system is unscriptural.

The discussion on the proposed *Colloquium*, though not so lengthy, was earnest and exciting. Two reports, a majority and minority one, were presented. The majority report was adopted by a vote of 66 to 29. It is due to the General Synod to say that the action in reference to the *Colloquium* is not to be interpreted as any indication of a lack of disposition to cultivate the most friendly relations or to favor union in the Lutheran Church. Those who opposed the appointment of delegates and voted for the majority report claim to be as

warm friends of peace and union in the Church as those who voted on the other side. It was with them a question of expediency and of probable results. They could see in it no indications for good to the Church—no promise of any practical gain, but on the contrary reasons for apprehension of evil. The resolutions adopted will best speak for themselves. After saying that,

“ This General Synod desires to assure the General Council
“ of its readiness to co-operate in any and every way proper
“ and practicable, affording promise of success in promoting
“ that concord, union and fellowship in the Church, to which
“ the Constitution and history of this body have committed
“ it.”

It is added :

“ Inasmuch, however, as the ‘doctrinal positions’ of the
“ general bodies invited to concur in arranging for the Collo-
“ quium are clearly defined and set forth in their Constitu-
“ tions and official acts, by which alone they are willing to
“ be judged, and that of this body, especially, is fully and
“ unmistakably stated in its adoption of the Unaltered Augs-
“ burg Confession, and has been long and fully settled—a
“ position which it entertains no idea of changing—we can-
“ not see either any need of such Colloquium between these
“ different parts of our Church as a necessary preparation
“ for the mutual ‘recognition, by each body, of the position
“ of the other’ as Lutheran, or any advantage from it in the
“ way of attaining a better understandig or interpretation of
“ their doctrinal differences, since its members, according to
“ the terms under which it is proposed to be held, ‘cannot
“ bind, and are not to be looked upon as binding them-
“ selves or the Synods to which they belong,’ and cannot in-
“ terpret authoritatively those official utterances which state
“ the relations of their respective bodies to the Augsburg
“ Confession. We do not regard the proposed Colloquium,
“ in the present state of the Church, and under the conditions
“ in which it is to meet, as a means suited to promote the
“ cause of peace and union, nor as an equivalent for the mu-

"tual recognition and fellowship implied in regular inter-synodical correspondence.

"While, therefore, we decline to take part in the arrangements for the proposed Colloquium, we reiterate our proposal for correspondence by accredited delegates, as the most fitting thing, in this respect, between those general bodies of our Lutheran Zion, and as promising most for the future unity and harmony of the Church."

Since this action of the General Synod we have learned from reliable sources that the same views were entertained by leading members of the General Council. It is to be hoped that the day of union and co-operation may not be delayed by any action in any of our ecclesiastical bodies. A truly harmonious and united Evangelical Lutheran Church must be an object of desire to every friend of the Church, and to this, as we are assured by both reports, the Constitution and history of the General Synod have committed it.

The Committee on the Liturgy, and that on the Catechism both reported. The Committees were continued with authority in both cases to print cheap editions for examination and present use. Interesting reports were also presented on German Publications, a German Hymn Book, Systematic Beneficence, Statistics, Literary and Theological Institutions, Sunday Schools, Correspondence with other Ecclesiastical Bodies, State of the Church, etc. Some of these reports contain matters of great interest, and we would be glad to lay them before our readers, but it would swell this notice to an undue length. In a general way it may be said that the subject of Systematic Beneficence needs much more attention than it has yet received: our Literary and Theological Institution are advancing: Sunday Schools are flourishing, increasing in members and efficiency: correspondence is maintained with nine ecclesiastical bodies, furnishing proof of the fraternal feelings existing among these different Churches: the state of the Church is considered as highly encouraging. In every department there is room for improvement, and cause

for humiliation, yet much to encourage in the manifest tokens of the divine presence and blessing.

The published "*Parochial Chart*" shows under one head—"Local Objects"—contributions to the amount of nearly a million of dollars, and we have no doubt but this is much below the mark. Should the recommendation of the General Synod be observed, to include in the column for "Local Objects" the pastor's salary and all items of local expense in each congregation, no doubt the amount will be doubled. It is a matter of great regret that our statistics are furnished so incomplete and so unreliable. The table in the minutes of the General Synod exhibits, in round numbers, ten thousand less communicants than the table in the last Lutheran Almanac, although both are compiled from the same general sources. A corresponding difference will be found in other items. If these reports are to be of any value there should be more pains to secure accuracy. We believe that from our method of reporting, all our statistics are below the actual numbers. A good deal is overlooked in all these reports. The remedy may not be so easy, but the defect must be apparent to all. The actual strength and working of the General Synod are not fully presented in any of our statistical tables.

Very many of the Protestant pulpits in Baltimore were filled by members of Synod on the Sabbath. It is doubtful if ever in one day and in one city so many sermons were preached by Lutheran ministers as on that Sabbath day in the city of Baltimore.

The great gathering was in the afternoon, when the General Synod and some two thousand Sunday School children, with officers, teachers and friends assembled in the large Masonic Temple. Eight Sunday Schools, English and German were present. The sight was grand and inspiring. It was a welcome of the children to the General Synod. Their thousand voices made the Temple ring, and their happy faces thrilled every heart with delight. What have not Christ and His Church done for Children! Short and happy addresses were made by Drs. Stelling and Magee, and Revs.

Goodlin, Rhodes and Ort. "Ein Feste Burg" was sung in German. The occasion will not soon be forgotten either by the members of the General Synod or the Sunday Schools of Baltimore.

On Monday afternoon the General Synod indulged in one of those delightful recreations and entertainments which modern ecclesiastical bodies sometimes are permitted to enjoy. Through the kindness of Messrs. Appold and Rice an excursion was furnished the Synod down the Bay in the fine steamer Columbia. Accompanied by many members of the churches, the afternoon passed most agreeably, and the party was back in time for the anniversary of the Publication Board in the evening.

The last meeting of the General Synod was characterized by a spirit of kindness and brotherly love, and a disposition to attend to the practical work of the church. Matters of dispute were deemed of less importance than works about which all were agreed. The building up of our churches and the extension of Christ's kingdom were uppermost in the minds of the members. In this light we regard the unwillingness of the General Synod to waste time and effort in the very doubtful experiment of the Colloquium. The organization of the General Synod is well tried and satisfactory. There is no disposition to begin to dig at the foundation, and unsettle the whole superstructure. What is now needed is to go on and build. The doctrinal position of the General Synod is not only satisfactory to the mass of those who adhere to it, but any attempt to materially change it would most certainly meet with failure and stern rebuke. The felt want is not endless discussion over disputed points of doctrine, but the giving of the gospel to the needy and perishing at home and in foreign lands. The world is open to the Gospel, and the world needs the Gospel. The fields are white unto the harvest. At no time in the history of the General Synod was the injunction—"go work in my vineyard"—more urgent, or the prospect of rich results more promising. We have no occasion to indulge in fanciful pictures. There

is simply a great work for us to do, and we should do it with our might.

The next meeting of the General Synod will be held in Carthage, Illinois, on the first Wednesday after Trinity Sunday, 1877.

ARTICLE X.

THE WORK OF THE REVIEW.

With this number the REVIEW completes a half decade of years under its present editorial conduct. This suggests a brief glance at its work, and what has been accomplished in the way of fulfilling its aims. A few words about the Review itself may not be wholly out of place. The editors feel that something of this kind is due alike to themselves and the readers of the Quarterly, and may not be without some points of interest and suggestion to the Church.

In taking charge of the QUARTERLY REVIEW of the Lutheran Church the general ideas and principles on which it was to be conducted were distinctly and fully set forth. They were believed to be wise and just in themselves, and adapted to the exigencies of the Church. The REVIEW had already, for twenty-one years, efficiently served her interests and promoted her honor. The principles set forth for its continued management by the present editors were, to some extent, determined from its previous position and relations. They were only modified to suit the altered condition of things in the Church. After five years' experience under them, and with a view to answer some criticisms, it seems proper to recall, in a few brief extracts, a number of the points in the plans and purposes of the REVIEW as then announced: *

1. "It is designed to be a Review *for the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. By this, it is not meant that it will be narrow or exclusive, ignoring other Churches, or shutting them

* Vol I. pp. 7—9.

"out from any place in its pages, but simply that it will be devoted to the interests of the Lutheran Church—and of the whole Lutheran Church."

2. "At the same time the position of the Editors must be distinctly understood. They stand unequivocally on the basis of the General Synod. * * * So far as they may have occasion to give utterance to their views they will not hesitate to maintain their theological and ecclesiastical position. This they hope to do in a courteous and Christian manner, and giving equal privileges to those who may differ from them."

3. "But the position of the Editors is not intended to interfere with the largest freedom of all parts of the Church. The REVIEW will be open to all, not as a matter of courtesy, graciously extended, but as a right freely acknowledged. * * * The invitation to all is candid, frank, and cordial, and given without distinction as to Synodical or theological peculiarities."

4. "The Review will embrace a wide range of discussion. Anything bearing upon the interests of Religion, Morality, Science, Philosophy, Literature, Christian Civilization, or the general welfare of mankind will come within its scope."

It is a matter of satisfaction to the Editors, that the work of the REVIEW for five years, while not securing all the ends desired and aimed at, has justified the principles and plan adopted and set forth in these extracts. A large and gratifying measure of success has been reached, and the Quarterly has been accorded an honorable rank among the publications of its class in our country. The notices of it by the press, which we have no reason to believe to be specially partial toward it, have alluded to its ability and value in highly complimentary terms. The Editors will say nothing of their own contributions to its pages—concerning which it does not become them to speak—but apart from their own work, many of its articles have been mentioned as of very high excellence, and some of them as among the very best discussions of the subjects treated that have appeared. Quite a number of its articles have received the compliment of being

since reprinted for wider circulation and influence, either as tracts or in the papers of the Church, while several of them have been republished in the Quarterly of a sister denomination. We have every reason to believe that the REVIEW has represented the Lutheran Church very honorably among the Christian Churches of our country. In the general excellence of its matter, as well as its general material make-up, it stands in creditable comparison with the Quarterlies of other denominations. Beyond all doubt it has been a source of great good within the Lutheran Church. It has served to no small extent, to draw out and develop its literary and theological life and activity. The discussions in its pages by many of our foremost men, of great doctrinal and practical questions in connection with our Church position and work, and of other topics of philosophical or moral bearings, have not been without moulding and directing influence. They have not been as rain on a rock or showers on the desert sand, making no impression and bearing no fruit. And like the contributions in the volumes of the old series, they will form a collection of our Church's literary and theological thought and activity for the time, that will prove of permanent and increasing value. That the place thus filled with the fruitful work of the REVIEW should have been left a blank, would have been at once a shame and loss to our Church.

There is one point, however, at which the Editors feel that a better success should have been secured, and it is to refer to this, mainly, that this statement concerning the work of the REVIEW has been introduced. But the failure is one which is due to no fault of theirs. A part of the Church has almost entirely refused to co-operate in sustaining and using this agency for our Church's development. The extracts given above show how carefully, directly and fully the rules of the REVIEW were arranged to constitute an open medium for the free use and service of *the whole Lutheran Church* in this country. Whilst care was taken to secure the fair rights of the General Synod, in connection with whose Institutions and work it had been originated, and sustained for

twenty-one years, an equal right to its pages and free discussion in them was freely conceded to all parts of the Church, and they have been, in repeated phrase, invited and asked to use them. From the very first the Editors announced: "*The REVIEW will be open to all, not as a matter of courtesy, graciously extended, but as a right freely acknowledged.*" It is difficult to see what more the Editors could have done in the way of a fair recognition of all portions of our divided Church in the common use of the REVIEW. But they went farther than this. They wrote personal letters to a large number of leading men in the General Council as well as in other connections, specially requesting them to co-operate in sustaining the REVIEW and to contribute such articles as they might desire on our Church questions or other topics. Assurances were given of a real desire that it might be held, as it had been before, the open medium for discussion and comparison of view by all parties and tendencies among us. To these letters, as far as they were addressed to members of the General Council, the courtesy of a reply was in most cases wanting. Only a few responses were received, and these were in the way of declining the request. As if by concerted purpose, ministers and laymen from that division of the Church declined to become subscribers, and its subscription list, though larger than it ever was before, has been made up almost entirely of names in connection with the General Synod, with a very fair co-operation and support from the General Synod South, and some from the Synodical Conference. From those connected with the General Council, which counts so large a communion list, and asserts for itself such peculiar zeal for pure Lutheran doctrine, and a mission to set forth and vindicate that doctrine, there has been a persistent withholding of co-operation. Only six articles have been thus contributed—by three writers. The number is small, and the statement will doubtless surprise the Church. But the surprise will be even greater, to know that this number of articles is just equal to the number of subscribers in that connection. That a leading representative of the Council, instead of using the QUARTERLY of his own Church,

should seek and employ as a medium for the publication of his writing another denomination's Review with not much more than half the number of subscribers, indicates, for this refusal of co operation of which we speak, a separatistic and implacable spirit stronger than was believed to exist when the basis of a common right to the REVIEW was announced. In face of this self-exclusion from the discussions of the QUARTERLY, the invitation to a colloquium for comparison of views on the Augsburg Confession can hardly be understood.

Among the criticisms with which the QUARTERLY has been favored, there has been one, repeated again and again, which deserves some attention. This comes in the form of a complaint that it contains so little which marks it as a *Lutheran Review*. It is alleged that it presents little or nothing in connection with Lutheran doctrine and the interests of our Church. This criticism becomes important and deserves notice, from the fact that if the allegation be correct it must form a real objection to its management. It must be remembered, however, that it has never been proposed, either in the origination of the REVIEW, or in the new series under its present editorship, to make it so purely theological and ecclesiastical as to exclude subjects of more general character. Like journals of the same class under the auspices of other denominations, it has always been meant to include in its scope "Religion, Morality, Science, Philosophy, Literature, Christian Civilization, and the general welfare of mankind." Any narrower range than this would be unworthy of our position among the Christian Churches of our day and country, and fail to represent the mission of Christianity as meant to sanctify all things and wield them in the service of the divine kingdom. No idea could well be more contracted and unworthy, than that nothing is Lutheran which does not confine itself to the specialties of a few denominational dogmas or ceremonial usages. Lutheranism, as we understand it, is a synonym for the whole of a pure, efficient, world-redeeming Christianity. All things are Christ's. And when the movement and scope of a true Lutheran Christianity, or of a Lutheran Quarterly Review, is represented as fulfilled

only in ringing the changes on a few distinctive doctrinal articles, apart from the saving truths received in common by the Church universal, and the world-transforming work which the Saviour has commissioned his people to fulfil, the representation stands in misapprehension or ignorance of both the teaching and life of Lutheranism. We have not so learned Lutheranism—as a narrow, partial, arrogating, exclusive sectarianism—and hope we never shall. But even on the narrower idea on which this complaint seems to have been conceived, the alleged want of articles treating of matters involving the doctrine and work of the Lutheran Church cannot be justly charged against the REVIEW. It is contradicted by the facts in the case—as these facts speak for themselves. Besides an annual Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession—generally a long and elaborate presentation of some prominent phase of confessional Lutheran theology—we count about forty articles on subjects connected with the teachings and work of the Lutheran Church. All this within five years, surely does not justify the allegation that the REVIEW has no denominational cast. The charge is one of those random assertions for which only the spirit of misrepresentation or prejudice can be responsible. The unfairness in urging it, in the case of one of the critics, is the more unaccountable, as he himself is a valued contributor to the pages of the QUARTERLY, and his own articles have not specially helped to make it more distinctively Lutheran.

The REVIEW invites the candid and discriminating criticism of all its friends, and assures them that it will profit by all good suggestions. The attitude of a portion of the Church, however, is felt to be neither just nor honorable in its separatistic and querulous treatment of its work. If the full measure of success and excellence has not in some respects been reached by the QUARTERLY, it becomes those who desire the best prosperity and honor of our Zion, not to stand off and criticise, but to lend the help and furnish the strength needed. This is the plain duty in the case, looked at from their own standpoint.

This notice of the relations of some parties in the Church to the work and conduct of the REVIEW must not be understood as the expression of any personal grievance on the part of the Editors in the matter, nor as if the QUARTERLY were, in their judgment, greatly suffering from their failure to take part, or from their criticisms. The subscription list, we believe, was never larger than at present. This is specially gratifying in view of the fact, that the last five years have been unusually trying in the department of journalism. The general depression of business and monetary disarrangement throughout the country, have compelled the abandonment of many apparently well-established newspapers. We see it stated that over two hundred papers of different kinds have had to stop during the past year. Several prominent *Quarterlies* have been strengthened by being merged into one, and in one or two cases the want of support has led to a transference of the publication from a church society, which had no funds to support it, to private hands able to assume the responsibility. That our Lutheran REVIEW has, in these trying times, been able to continue its work and pay its way, without the aid of the parties mentioned as declining to co-operate, is an encouraging evidence of the firm standing it has secured in the favor of the Church. Its influence, too, in the right direction of the thought and work of the Church is most gratifyingly healthy and efficient. The interests of the General Synod, on whose basis the Editors unequivocally stand and the prosperity of whose work they feel themselves specially bound to promote, are even the more exclusively served in the present course of things. But whilst in this respect the REVIEW is accomplishing its work well, and with an efficiency and directness never before attained by it, the Editors desire—and this is the meaning of this notice of the course of those who have stood aloof—to have it understood that for the only partial representation of our Church in its pages, they are not at all responsible. Their object here is to answer complaints, not to make them. They answer, not for their own sakes, but for the sake of right understanding and open justice in the Church. Their love embraces the whole

Lutheran Church, and they wish to see it all, as far as possible, united and prosperous. They think the REVIEW should be made the common medium for comparison of views on our Church questions. They believe that if such comparison of views is conducted in Christian spirit and manner, it can hardly fail to lead to better understanding, and at least to mutual recognition and brotherly kindness, if not to organic union. The responsibility of preventing this must attach to those who claim to have found 'the one, true, original and only sense' of our Confession on the points of differing interpretation, but who refuse this standing request for free conference—a thing which they declare so needful and full of promise for the harmony and union of our Church.

The REVIEW will continue to be conducted on the principles which have guided it in the past. It invites the co-operation of the whole Church. Of the need of vigorously sustaining it for the service of our Lutheran Zion, there can be no doubt. The right standing and work of each denomination of Christians require the agency of a Quarterly Review. This is indeed a day of books, and almost every important subject receives extended discussion on them. But books, however numerous issued, do not destroy the need of the REVIEW. They cannot take its place, or answer its special ends. It is a denomination's most convenient medium—almost an absolutely necessary one—for the discussion of all the various questions which the Church's life and work are continually calling up. Many of the most important theological and practical inquiries that are to be settled, demand a discussion altogether too extended for the weekly religious paper; but they are at the same time too restricted in their relations to call for separate volumes. They are often too pressing to wait for appearance in such a form. Only a few persons can be heard through books. This means of putting forth their views is beyond the reach of most of those who should be heard. The literature of a Church, therefore, as it appears in the range of Review discussions, represents the thought and conclusions of the Church in its most vital relations and practical activities. It is concerned

with the living questions of the day, and becomes the mirror of the living Church. The record shows the onward stream of its theology and life. When these discussions are carried up, as they ought to be, into the higher fields of Scripture truth, they become peculiarly effective means for the development of the theology of the Church. That our Lutheran REVIEW has been serving the progress of the Church in this way is beyond question. It has a mission yet before it. In these days, in which thought and investigation in every department of truth are peculiarly active, and the Christian faith is assailed by varied forces of error and skepticism, its agency is specially needful among us. Its right influence requires its wise management and a generous support. The amount of good it will accomplish will depend upon the vigor with which it is carried on, and the readiness of its friends to give forth through it their best and most carefully considered thought in all the questions of our Church life and work. It will be what the Church makes it; and it is earnestly hoped that it will be made an agency of still increasing good among us, and prove of great service to the holy cause of truth and to all the interests of our Zion.

ARTICLE XI.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*The Holy Bible*, according to the Authorized Version (A. D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church, edited by F. A. Cook, M. A., Vol. V.—Isaiah, Jeremiah and Lamentation; *Jonah, the Self-willed Prophet*, a practical Exposition of the Book of Jonah, together with a Translation and Exegetical Notes, by Stuart Mitchell; "*The Light by Which we see Light*," or Nature and the Scriptures, a Course of Lectures delivered before the Theological Seminary and Rutgers College, by Taylor Lewis, LL. D. (the Vedder Lectures, 1875); *St. Paul, his Life, his Work, and his Writings*, by W. H. Davenport Adams, with Map.

PHILOSOPHICAL AND SCIENTIFIC.—*How to Teach Chemistry*, Hints to

Science Teachers and Students, by Edward Frankland, D. C. L., forty-seven illustrations; *Insectivorous Plants*, by Charles Darwin; *The Transformation of Insects*, by Prof. P. Martin Duncan, M. D., F. R. S., new edition with 240 illustration; *Elements of Physical Geography*, by Prof. E. J. Houston, M. A.; *Fungi*, Their Nature and Uses, by M. C. Cook, M. A., LL. D., edited by M. J. Berkeley, M. A., F. L. S., International Scientific Series; *First Book of Zoology*, by Edward S. Morse, Ph. D., formerly Prof. of Comp. Anatomy and Zoology in Bowdoin College; *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, the Philosophy of Positive Law, by the late John Austin, abridged for the use of students by Robert Campbell.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Assyria*, from the Earliest times to the Fall of Nineveh, by Geo. Smith, the second vol. of Ancient History from the Monuments; *Life of the Greeks and Romans*, by E. Gahl and W. Koner; *Norse Mythology*, or the Religion from Forefathers—all the Myths of the Eddas carefully systematized and interpreted, with an Introduction, Vocabulary and Index, by R. B. Anderson, M. A., Professor of Scandinavian Languages in the University of Wisconsin; *Famous Men of Ancient Times*, by S. C. Goodrich; *Lives of Celebrated American Indians*, by S. C. Goodrich; *A History of England*, for the Use of Schools, by L. E. Thalheimer; *The Life of the Rev. John Todd, D. D.*, by Rev. John E. Todd; *Historical Christianity*, a Series of Sketches on the Church, by Rt. Rev. Alex. Chas. Garrett, D. D.; a revised Edition of Dr. E. H. Gillett's *History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States*, in two 12mo volumes, by Presb. Board of Publication.

TRAVELS, &c.—*A Summer in Norway*, with Notes on the Industry, Habits, Customs, and Peculiarities of the People, the History and Institutions of the Country, its Climate, Topography and Productions, also an account of the Red Deer, Reindeer, and Elk, by John Dean Caton, LL. D., ex-chief Justice of Illinois; *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans*, by Melinda Rankin; *Nooks and Corners of the New England Coast*, by Samuel Adams Drake, with numerous illustrations; *Three Months in the Orient*, also Life in Rome and the Vienna Exposition, by Orville J. Bliss; *Forty Years in the Turkish Empire*, Memoirs of Rev. Wm. Goodell, late Missionary at Constantinople, by E. D. G. Prime, D. D.; *Four Thousand Miles of African Travel*, a personal record of a Journey up the Nile and through the Soudan to the confines of Central Africa, embracing a discussion of the Sources of the Nile and the examination of Slave Trade, by Alvan S. Southworth.

POETRY.—*Queen Mary*, by Alfred Tennyson.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*The Childhood of Religious*, by Edwin Clodd, F. R. A. S.; *How to Live Long*, or Health Maxims, Physical, Mental and Moral, by W. W. Hall, M. D.; *Sermons out of the Church*, by the author of "John Halifax;" *A Domestic Problem*, Work and Culture in the Household, by Mrs. A. M. Dox; *Curiosities of Human Nature*, by S. C. Goodrich; *The Temperance Reformation* and its Claims upon the Chris-

tian Church, by Rev. James Smith; *Civil Law in its Relation to Church Property, Polity, and Discipline*, by Wm. Strong, LL. D., Judge Supreme Court of United States; *Prohibition Does Prohibit*, or Prohibition not a Failure, by J. N. Stearns; *Church Decoration*, a Practical Manual of Appropriate Ornamentation, edited by a Practical Illuminator, with 16 full-page illustrations.

BRITISH.

A General History of Rome, from the foundation of the City to the Fall of Augustulus, B. C. 753—A. D. 476, by Charles Merivale, D. D., Dean of Ely; *Thackeryana*, Notes and Anecdotes, illustrated by over six hundred Fac-simile Sketches by Wm. Makepeace Thackeray, depicting humorous incidents in his School Life, Favorite Characters, in the books of his every-day reading, etc., now first published from his original drawings; *On Actors and the Art of Acting*, by George Henry Lewes; *Three Northern Love Stories* and other Tales from the Icelandic, by E. Magnusson and William Morris; *Shakespeare's Library*, a collection of all the well-known Plays, Novels, Tales, and other Articles which the great poet is supposed to have employed in the composition of his works, with Introduction, Notes Variorum, and Additional Notes, by W. C. Hazlitt, in five vols.; *On the Sensation of Tone, as a Physiological Basis for the Theory of Music*, by Prof. H. L. F. Helmholtz of Heidelberg, translated by Alex. A. Ellis; *New Reformation*, Narrative of Old Catholic Movement, 1870—1875; *St. John, the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, by Christoph Ernst Luthart, revised, translated, and the literature much enlarged, by Caspar Rene Gregory.

GERMAN.

German booksellers are complaining that there is not much demand for books of a positively Christian character. Before 1874 statistics showed that annually there were more works on theology published than in any other department of literature. But in that year theology takes the third place, being surpassed in numbers by the works on education and on law. The total number of publications in all departments was 12,070, of which 1,094 were theological, being 145 less than in 1873.

BIBLICAL.—Of exegetical works a number of new and improved editions have lately been published. The third edition of *Knobel's Genesis* has been prepared by Prof. Dr. A. Dillmann of Berlin. The changes made have been so great that this edition is in many respects a new work. The second edition of C. F. Keil's commentary on the books of Samuel has recently appeared. It is a part of Keil and Delitzsch's Biblical Commentary of the Old Testament. Of Meyer's excellent critical and exegetical commentary, the fourth edition enlarged and improved, of the volume on Philippians, Colossians and Philemon, has been published. It contains a biography of the recently deceased author, by his son. The second part of E. W. Hengstenberg's commentary on Job, 364 pp., has

appeared. Delitzsch's new work on the Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes, 461 pp., constitutes the fourth volume on the poetical books in Keil and Delitzsch's Biblical commentary. As a supplement to this commentary Keil has recently published a commentary on the books of Maccabees, 428 pp. Volkmar of Zuerich is preparing a series of commentaries on the Epistles of the New Testament. He belongs to the Tübingen school of theology. The first volume, on Romans, has been published, containing the Vatican text, a German translation and an exposition, 188 pp. The translation of the New Testament by Prof. Dr. C. Weizsäcker of Tübingen, published recently, is made from the text of Tischendorf's eighth edition.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.—The first volume of the scholarly work on Lutheran Dogmatics, by Dr. K. F. A. Kahnis, thoroughly revised by the author, has been published, 518 pp. The first edition contained three volumes, the new one will contain only two. The author's views on subscription to the Confessions of the Church are strikingly similar to those held by the General Synod. Of Dr. F. A. Philippi's work on Dogmatics, the second edition of the fifth volume, 299 pp., has been published. The changes made have not been great. The author belongs to the strictly orthodox Lutheran party. The new work entitled "The Ev. Lutheran Dogmatics of the seventeenth century," by Dr. Schulze, 285 pp., is of a popular character. "University Lectures on Biblical Dogmatics," by Prof. J. Wickelhaus, 157 pp. This posthumous volume is edited by Dr. A. Zahn of Halle. It treats of inspiration, of the being and attributes of God and His works, and of man and the law. The first volume of the third edition of Wuttke's important work on Ethics, enlarged and improved, is edited by Prof. L. Schulze of Rostock. The work of F. Reiff, on "The Faith of Churches and Church-parties" (*Der Glaube der Kirchen und Kirchenparteien*), 603 pp., treats of the different doctrinal views now prevalent in the Christian Church. It belongs to the department of symbolics. A. Franck's "Fundamental Truths of Religion," 108 pp., consists of lectures on Religion, the Living God, Religion and Morality, Jesus Christ, the credibility of the Gospel History, and Immortality. Dr. A. Ritschl of Göttingen, author of the learned work on Justification and Reconciliation, has published a small volume, 110 pp., on Schleiermacher's Addresses on Religion and their influence on the Ev. Church of Germany. On the "Religious Teachings of Kant" a volume of 112 pages has been published by Dr. G. C. B. Puenjer. And Dr. W. Rosenkrantz has published a volume of 186 pp. on the Principles of Theology.

The following contributions have been made to Christian Ethics. *The Inner Life*, by Dr. R. Loeber, 2nd edition, 368 pp. *Christian Ethics*, by P. T. Culmann, 2nd edition, 496 pp.

HISTORICAL.—*The History of German Mysticism in the Middle Ages*, by W. Preger. First Part. 488 pp. This volume, the result of long labor and great research, traces the history of German Mysticism down to the death of Master Eckhart. E. H. von Busch has prepared a work of

more than three hundred pages on the history and statistics of the Evangelical Lutheran churches and schools of Finland. This finishes the author's volumes on the Lutheran Church of Russia, which have taken much time and immense labor. In 1870 there were 764 Lutheran ministers and 1,732,621 members in Finland. *Studies in the History of the Old Church*, by F. Overbeck. 229 pp. The volume discusses the pseudo-Justinian letter to Diognetus, the laws against the Christians from the time of Trajan till Marcus Aurelius, and the relation of the Old Church to slavery in the Roman empire. Dr. W. Goss is editing the lectures of Dr. E. L. T. Henke, on *Modern Church History*. The first volume on the *History of the Reformation*, 448 pp., has been published. It treats of the German and Swiss Reformation, then of the spread of the Reformation in Europe, and lastly of the sects and parties. *The Beginnings of the Roman Catholic idea of the Church*, by Hackenschmidt, 1st vol., 194 pp., contains the New Testament dogma of the Church and the history of the dogma till the time of Cyprian.

BIOGRAPHICAL.—Among recent biographies are the following: *Life of K. R. Hagenbach*, the well known theologian of Basle, 150 pp. *John Peter Hebel*, by G. Laengin, 230 pp. *J. C. Hamann*, the Magician of the North, by G. Poel, 440 pp. *Francesco Spiera*, by K. Roenneke, 154 pp.

J. H. W. S.

ARTICLE XII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE LUTHERAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

42 North 9th street, Philadelphia.

Justification By Faith, as held and taught by Lutherans, together with the associated doctrines of Sanctification, and the Union of the Soul with Christ; or the Lutheran Doctrine of the Inner Life. A book for the people. By Simeon W. Harkey, D. D., author of "Church's Best State;" "Value of an Evangelical Ministry;" "Daily Prayer Book," etc. pp. 230. 1875.

If we were to follow the sage advice, not to read a book before we review it, we would be at a loss what to say of this little volume. The notices which have appeared in our church papers, while upon the whole highly favorable, would leave some room for doubt in regard to its character. It might perhaps be taken for granted from Dr. Harkey's well known reputation, and the endorsement of the Board of Publication, that the work was sound; and accordingly the General Synod papers have, by editorial notices and special communications, warmly recommended it to their readers. But such a volume must pass other ordeals, and the curiosity was quite natural to know what the professed representatives of

genuine Lutheranism—of sound doctrine—would say. And here we find difference of opinion. The *Lutheran and Missionary* gave it a tolerably lengthy notice and warm commendation: but the *Lutheran Standard* scented rank heresy, and says the "book is unsatisfactory," and "cannot be recommended to our people." The "serious blemishes" alleged to be found in it, the critic thinks "attributable mainly to the Pelagianizing views of his General Synod School, of which notwithstanding the use which he has made of the Book of Concord, he has not been able wholly to divest himself."

When such judges differ, there is no way left but to venture to think and speak for ourselves, and accordingly it has been found necessary to examine the book. We do not propose to attempt a minute or thorough criticism, but to offer a candid expression of our judgment.

And first of all, the venerable author may be congratulated on the appearance of this volume and the reception it has met. The divine promise, "They shall still bring forth fruit in old age," is surely his; and he has no reason to complain of the attention the volume has received. Although the subject is a very familiar one, its transcendent importance should secure for it the most earnest attention. The volume we believe to be timely and trust it may have a wide circulation and careful reading.

We think we can assure our readers that the volume is a safe one for them to read and study. Lutherans acknowledge the Bible as the only infallible guide in matters of faith and practice, but they accord to good books a proper place in explaining and enforcing the teaching of the Divine Word, and in this light this work will be found helpful. It would not be difficult to pick out words and forms of expression that are open to criticism, but the volume is not designed as a learned or theological treatise on the subject. It is not intended as a text book for students, where the precise meaning of every word should be carefully weighed, but as the author says, "The book is intended for the *people* rather than for theologians." This of course would be no excuse for the teaching of error, or for the inculcation of any thing "contrary to sound doctrine," but it is some excuse for a style better adapted to the comprehension of the common reader than to please learned critics. From the style, we should judge that much of the book may have been preached, and hence some things will be found that seem designed to make a present popular impression—to move the heart and determine the will, as well as to enlighten the understanding. The author has been more accustomed to write for the pulpit than for the press, and his language savors more of a free spoken style than of a severely chaste written one. But for this very reason it will be more readable with those for whom it is specially designed.

Our author intimates that the doctrine of *Justification by Faith* is not as well understood in our Church as it should be, and that this lack of

knowledge is not confined to our own Church—especially does he think this to be true of the doctrine “as taught in our Lutheran Confessions, and by our best Lutheran authors.” In confirmation of the lack of knowledge of this kind in some quarters, it may be stated as a fact, that, some time since, a minister of another denomination, and that one of the most intelligent in our land, gravely inquired, *if Lutherans really believed in the doctrine of Justification by Faith*. It may be that this graduate of a College and leading Theological Seminary, had never heard much of Martin Luther of the Augsburg Confession, or of anything else theological outside of his own Church. A little better acquaintance with the Lutheran Church, and especially with Lutheran Theology would serve to dispel some very common errors in the minds of other Churches. Dr. Harkey has shown at some length, in Chapter III. what Lutherans hold and believe on the subject. His quotations from Lutheran authorities should satisfy any candid mind.

In the concluding chapters, the subjects of sanctification, and the union of the believing soul with Christ, are discussed. The extravagant pretensions of some modern saints are exposed in a very plain and matter of fact manner; and at the same time the true union of the believer with Christ is urged and enforced. Some will perhaps hesitate to go as far as the author, when he says, “Every true believer *may* be, *must* be, is FULLY ASSURED of his acceptance with God, and of all that God has promised, just in so far as he has real faith.” Dr. Harkey is accustomed to use strong language, and in some instances in this volume he has indulged in this custom. His statements are not always as careful as they might be.

We may say of this book in brief, that it is a good one and will do good. In style it is popular rather than learned, rhetorical rather than critical, vigorous rather than elegant, impressive rather than persuasive. It may be read with profit by all. Could the Board of Publication publish more works in this line—works designed to exhibit the doctrines and spirit of our Lutheran Church—it would accomplish more to secure the end of its establishment, and to gain a faster hold on the sympathy and benevolence of the Church.

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO., NEW YORK.

Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.

The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version (A. D. 1611) with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited By F. C. Cook, M. A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Vol. V. Isaiah—Jeremiah—Lamentations. pp. 606. 1875.

This is the fifth volume of what is most familiarly and commonly known as *The Speaker's Commentary*. As the first volume on the distinctly Prophetical Books, it occupies a very important field and must interest

students of the divine word. The part of the volume on Isaiah is by Dr. W. Kay, Rector of Great Leghs, and formerly President of the Bishops' College, Calcutta. He has the reputation of being a sound scholar, and is known as the author of some learned works. The part on Isaiah and Lamentations is by Dr. R. Payne Smith, Dean of Canterbury, who attracted considerable attention during his visit to this country in attendance upon the Evangelical Alliance. Both belong to the class of what may be styled evangelical commentators.

The Introduction to Isaiah covers twenty-four pages and includes Introductory Remarks on the Prophetical Books: The Life and Times of Isaiah: The Unity of the Book of Isaiah: Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy: Appendices. A. List of the *Haftarahs* in Isaiah; B. The Critical Evidence respecting Chapters xiii.—xvi., etc.; C. Objections against supposing Chapters i. vi. xvii. to stand in chronological order. Following this are the Commentary and Critical Notes, pp. 25—310. A partial examination of the Commentary and Critical Notes makes the impression of a careful and judicious application of sound learning. The Notes and Comments are brief but to the point. There is no useless attempt to explain what needs no explanation, nor any parade of matter not bearing on the subject. Help is given where help is needed. Keeping in view the design of this commentary, it may be said that this part is well executed.

The Introduction to Jeremiah covers sixteen pages and includes the following topics: Jeremiah's name: His parentage: Political state of affairs: Moral state of Judea: Jeremiah's office: Jeremiah's character: Jeremiah's style: Arrangement of book: The title of the Book of Jeremiah: Prophecies against the Gentiles: The events after the fall of Jerusalem: The LXX. recension. The character of the Commentary and Notes on this book differs somewhat from that on Isaiah. The Commentary is more extended, and less critical. The author is more disposed to indulge in remarks in the way of application. The strictly critical Notes are generally quite brief. The Commentary on Jeremiah will be found more readable, and will require less study than that on Isaiah. That on Isaiah furnishes a great many more references to parallel and illustrative passages from other portions of Scripture. This on Jeremiah gives less of Scripture and more of the author's explanations. Which will be the more valuable will depend somewhat on the manner in which they are studied. Both have their merits, and both seem to be judiciously executed.

The Commentary on Lamentations, by the same author, possesses the same general character as that on Jeremiah. This most pathetic and touching poem, or series of plaintive lamentations, is according to the common view attributed to Jeremiah. It is gratifying to mark the sober character of the contents of this volume, and how the most learned criticism in general harmonizes with the commonly accepted views. We have had occasion to express a favorable judgment of this Commentary in the REVIEW, when noticing previous volumes, and our judgment is confirmed

by the character of this volume. It is not at all inferior to those which have preceded it. Rather the work improves as it progresses. The Introductions to two of the leading books of the prophets are most excellent productions of their kind, furnishing just what intelligent readers will desire to know. We have not noticed any superfluous material to swell the volume and weary the reader. The publishers deserve great credit for their enterprise in placing such works within the reach of those who desire a better acquaintance with the divine word. Among the numerous Commentaries on the Bible, the *Speaker's* is destined to occupy a prominent and peculiar position. It was called forth to meet a felt want, and meeting this it must continue to hold its place.

The Service of Praise; or Hymns and Tunes and Scripture Lessons.

Arranged for Praise Meetings and Public Worship, by Rev. Wm. T. Eustis, Springfield, Mass. pp. 336. 1875.

The number of books of this general class is a very significant fact, and especially considering the sources whence they come. Book after book is published for the purpose of social or public worship, having usually somewhat of a liturgic character. Most of these come, not from churches addicted to the use of liturgies and forms of worship, but from those which have made it a merit that they discarded and opposed every thing of the kind. Greater prominence is being given to the idea of worship, and to make this part of service more pleasing and attractive. Whether the zeal in this direction be according to wisdom or not, we do not now discuss, but the fact is very apparent. On all sides, except perhaps among those who consider it a sin to use any thing but Rouse's version of the Psalms in worship, we meet with publications of the kind indicated. They are prepared for families, for Sunday Schools, for social meetings, and for public worship. The author says of this book, "The Service of Praise was prepared to meet a call loud and general in the Churches of Christ for a fuller and freer participation in public worship by the congregation," and adds that "this call has already introduced the responsive reading of Scripture, and has also inaugurated the vesper service and the praise meeting, whose tendency, however, is to degenerate either into a sacred concert or a singing-school." The design of this volume is to meet the demand without encouraging the evil. It contains several Orders of public worship, and forms for special occasions such as the admission of members, baptism, the Lord's Supper, funerals, etc. etc., with selections for chanting, including the *Te Deum Laudamus*, *Gloria in Excelsis*, *Gloria Patri*, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, the Litany, etc. etc. We have provided also an offertory, or collection of Scripture texts to be read during the offerings of the Church. In the Orders of Public Worship the Lord's Prayer is to be repeated in concert. It will be seen that it is intended to be a pretty full Liturgy under another name—"The Service of Praise." We are not quite certain that the name of this Book

is any improvement on the more common titles which have been employed. We find that these 'Praise Services' include such subjects as the Death of Christ, Conviction of Sin, Penitence, Self denial, the Christian death, etc.; with such hymns as:

"When rising from the bed of death
O'erwhelmed with guilt and fear "

* * * * *

"Depth of mercy! can there be
Mercy still reserved for me,"

and others of a similar character.

The title is apt to suggest the so-called "Praise Meetings" quite popular in some regions. It really seems to be intended as a new Book of Worship. The volume has evidently been prepared with much care, and among those churches needing a book of this kind it seems well adapted to its purpose. Happily we Lutherans have a Book of Worship and a Liturgy at which we have been tinkering these many years. It may be encouraging to some to see how other denominations are trying to secure what Lutherans have always enjoyed as a right—participation in the worship of God's house. It may be well however to guard against any tendency to mere formalism. In opposition to ritualism the Church had swung to the extreme of baldness in worship; the swing is now in the opposite direction, and it would not be surprising if many should be captivated by the mere forms of religion. Every Church should have its order of worship, and its forms of service for special occasions. These should be prepared with the highest regard to the true idea of spiritual worship. To those who have no such helps this "Service of Praise" may be warmly commended.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

The Theistic Conception of the World. An Essay in opposition to certain tendencies of Modern Thought. By B. F. Cocker, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in the University of Michigan; author of "Christianity and Greek Philosophy." pp. 42. 1875.

The author of this volume was already favorably known by his contribution to religion and philosophy in a former work. This new discussion of an ever living and most important subject will add to his reputation as a thoughtful student and vigorous writer. The volume treats of what is fundamental to all true religion and sound philosophy—the being of God and His relations to the universe, or as it is styled "*The Theistic Conception of the World.*" The chief aim is to show that the theistic conception, as it is presented in the Bible, is in harmony with our own consciousness, true science, and sound philosophy. The book bears evidence on almost every page of the author's extensive and varied reading, and is en-

riched by abundant quotations from the choicest writers, in his field of thought, in ancient and modern times.

It would be impossible in a brief compass to give anything like a satisfactory analysis of this work. Much of it consists of concise statements which scarcely admit of condensation or abbreviation. It is divided into eleven chapters with the following titles: The Problem Stated; God the Creator; The Creation; Creation—The Genesis or Beginning; Creation—Its History; Conservation—The Relation of God to the World; Conservation—The Relation of God to the World; Providence of God in Human History—The Relation of God to Humanity; Special Providence and Prayer; Moral Government—Its Grounds, the Correlation between God and Man; Moral Government—Its Nature, Condition, Method and End.

The questions which present themselves to thinking minds and asks for a solution, are thus stated by our author :

“ 1. First of all, there have arisen the fundamental questions: Has the universe always existed, or had the Cosmos, with its changes and constants, its forces and laws, its forms and relations, a *Beginning*? Is its present condition but one link in an endless chain, one phasis in a series of changes, which had no beginning and shall have no end? Is the universe limited both in space and duration, or is it unlimited, unbeginning, and endless?”

“ 2. If the universe had a beginning, what is the $\alpha\rho\chi\eta$ —the originant, causative Principle in which or from which it had its beginning? How are we to conceive aright that First Principle of all existence and of all knowledge? is it material or spiritual, intelligent or unintelligent?

“ 3. What conception are we to form of the nature and mode of that beginning? Was it a pure supernatural Origination—an absolute creation? or was it simply a Formation out of a first matter or first force—an artistic, architectonic, demiurgic creation? Was that beginning determined by necessity or by choice? Was it an unconscious emanation from, or a necessary development of, the First Principle; or was it a conscious forth-putting of power for the realization of a foreseen, premeditated, predetermined plan—a *mental Order*.

“ 4. A supernatural Origination being assumed, then, from that first initial act of absolute creation, has the process of formation been gradual continuous, and uniform—a progressive *Evolution* from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from lower to higher forms, according to a changeless law of uniformity and continuity? or have there been marked, distinct, and successive stages of formation—creative epochs which may be called ‘new beginnings?’ Is the historic unity of creation a unity of Thought, an ideal consecution? or is it simply a physical unity grounded in a material nexus—a genetic connection resulting from the necessary action of physical causes?

“ 5. What is the relation of the Creator to the existing creation? Is the Deity, in any sense, immanent in, or does he dwell altogether apart from,

“ and out of all connection with, the universe? Has any finite thing or being an independent existence? Have the forces of nature any reality apart from the Divine efficiency? Did the Creator, in the beginning, give self-being to the substance of the universe, and endow it with properties and forces, so that it can exist and act apart from, and independently of, the First Cause? or is God still in nature upholding all substance, the power of all force, the life of all life, shaping all forms, and organizing all systems? Is God not only the Creator but the *Conservator* of all things?

“ 6. Is there any Ethical meaning, any moral significance in the universe? Is the physical order of the universe subordinated to a moral order in which freedom exists? Are there any indications that the existence of moral personality is the end toward which all the successive changes of nature have tended, and the progressive types of life have been a preparation and a prophecy? Was the earth designed to be a theatre for the development of moral character, the education and discipline of moral beings? Does the course of history reveal ‘a power that works for righteousness,’ and aims at the highest perfection of rational and free beings? In a word, is there a *Providential Government* of the world?

“ 7. Does man stand in a more immediate relation to God than the things of nature? Is each individual the charge of a providence, the subject of a moral government, and the heir to a future retribution? Has man a spiritual and immortal nature? Has he the power so to determine his own action and character that he can justly be held accountable, and treated as the proper subject of reward and punishment? In the final issue of things, will every human being meet his righteous deserts, and be rewarded or punished according to his works? In short, is man under *Moral Government*?

The answers to these questions involves the discussion of this volume. The author evinces learning and a readiness to meet the opponents of Bible Theism. He defends with marked ability the current orthodox views of God, Creator, Providence, and Moral Accountability. The main points of the materialistic philosophy of the present day are examined, and the shallowness of its pretences exposed. It is bracing to read such a volume, and it is commended to all who are in doubt, or who desire to know the arguments for the fundamental truths, that God is, and that He is the rewarder of them that seek Him. Without pledging ourselves to the endorsement of every interpretation of nature and revelation, or to the conclusiveness of every argument, we regard the work as one of sterling merit, and well calculated to confirm believers in their faith, and to silence, so far as argument can, the mouths of gainsayers.

The Character and Logical Method of Political Economy. By J. E. Cairnes, LL. D., Emeritus Professor of Political Economy in University

College, London, Author of "Some Leading Principles of Political Economy, Newly Propounded." pp. 235. 1875.

This volume is a new edition or reproduction of some lectures on Political Economy delivered by the author in Dublin more than seventeen years ago. The volume as it now appears, whilst maintaining the same views then put forth, has undergone extensive changes. We are informed that "numerous passages have been recast; increased prominence has been given to aspects of the case only touched on in the former volume; and some entirely new topics have been introduced." The distinguished author here gives us not so much a treatise on political economy, as a discussion of the nature and object of the science, and a defence of what he claims to be its legitimate character. Extreme views have prevailed on the subject of this science, and Professor Cairnes is at pains to point out the errors which have had more or less prevalence, and thus to prepare the way for a more rational and satisfactory course of investigation. Indeed, so conflicting and contradictory have been the views and theories advocated by different writers that many have been led to doubt whether political economy was entitled to rank as a science at all. Professor Cairnes aims to rescue the science from the misapprehensions and blunders to which it has been exposed, and to assert its true character and importance. He does not, with some, claim for it a place among the exact sciences, where everything can be determined with mathematical precision; nor does he admit, with others, that there are no laws which can be ascertained governing questions of political economy. "The doctrines of Political Economy are to be understood as asserting, not what *will* take place, but what *would* or what *tends* to take place, and in this sense only are they true." Some of the evils resulting from ignorance on this subject are brought out, and the importance of careful study and correct views inculcated. Few subjects of a merely secular character are more deserving the attention of our legislators, and indeed of all who choose to think upon questions of our political and social prosperity. Many of those who undertake to legislate for the public good are profoundly ignorant of the first principles of political economy. Laws are frequently enacted in violation of well established principles of right and public interest. Schemes are undertaken and carried forward only to terminate in disappointment and suffering. It can hardly be claimed that any amount of study in this department would furnish a remedy for all the ills of life and all the needs in society, but it might aid greatly in lessening them.

This volume of Professor Cairnes is commended as containing the mature thoughts of a ripe scholar and judicious writer. It cannot fail to instruct and improve. Its high moral tone is not its least recommendation. Political Economy, if not as a science, in its workings, has to do with the moral as well as with the material elements of a nation's wealth. It is as true in this science as in religion, that "righteousness exalteth a nation." To the question—"How far should moral and religious considerations be

admitted as coming within the purview of Political Economy?" Professor Cairnes answers: "Moral and religious considerations are to be taken account of by the economist precisely in so far as they are found, in fact, to affect the conduct of men in the pursuit of wealth. In so far as they operate in this way, such considerations are as pertinent to his inquiries as the desire for the physical well-being, or the propensity in human beings to reproduce their kind; and they are only less important as premises of his science than the latter principles, because they are far less influential with regard to the phenomena which constitute the subject matter of his inquiries." The present period beyond any preceding one calls for the thoughtful consideration of the topics discussed in this volume. Political and social problems are demanding a re-adjustment. The wisest of our leaders are often perplexed in deciding what is best to be done, and it must be perilous in the extreme to submit to the guidance of the ignorant and blind. It need hardly be added, what has already been intimated, that Professor Cairnes is regarded as standing in the very front rank of writers on this most important and difficult subject.

The Early Kings of Norway: Also an Essay on the Portraits of John Knox. By Thomas Carlyle, author of "The History of Frederick II., called Frederick the Great," "History of the French Revolution," "Past and Present," etc. pp. 257. 1875.

A book from Carlyle invites and is almost certain to receive attention. The reader deems it worth while to know what he has to say and how he says it; for he has a style of thinking and writing peculiarly his own. In this volume he furnishes us with some chapters in history but little known. The early Kings of Norway from "about the year of Grace 860," to use his own words, until about 1270, are the subjects for most graphic and stirring pictures of rude and barbarous times. Carlyle's admiration for courage and adventure, and his inclination to hero worship, make such subjects fitting themes for his peculiar and vigorous style. He seems to have lost none of his freshness or power. Whilst we may not fully share in his sympathy with his heroes, we cannot but admire his patience in study and power in delineation. We learn from this volume something of the manners and customs of those early times.

The monograph on the Portraits of John Knox, included in the volume, is an interesting and curious piece of literary work. Knox is one of his heroes, and he takes pleasure and delight in discussing and criticising these pictures of his favorite. An extract will furnish a clue to his zeal in this matter.

"Scottish Puritanism, well considered, seems to me distinctly the noblest and completest form that the grand Sixteenth Century Reformation anywhere assumed. We may say also that it has been by far the most widely fruitful form; for in the next century it had produced

Vol. V. No. 4. 79

“ English Cromwellian Puritanism, with open Bible in one hand, drawn
 “ Sword in the other, and victorious foot trampling on Romish Babylon ;
 “ that is to say, irrevocably refusing to believe what is not a Fact in
 “ God’s Universe, but a mingled mass of self-delusions and mendacities
 “ in the region of Chimera. So that now we look for the effects of it not
 “ in Scotland only, but over wide seas, huge American continents, and
 “ growing British Nations in every zone of the earth. And, in brief,
 “ shall have to admit that John Knox, the authentic Prometheus of all
 “ that, has been a most distinguished Son of Adam, and had probably a
 “ physiognomy worth looking at.”

A. D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Phila.,

The Philosophy of Natural Theology An Essay in Confutation of the
 Scepticism of the Present Day, which obtained a Prize at Oxford, Nov.
 26th, 1872. By the Rev. William Jackson, M. A., F. S. A., formerly
 Fellow of Worcester College, author of “Positivism,” “Right and
 Wrong,” “The Golden Spell,” etc. pp. 389. 1875.

This is a book for educated and intelligent men, who are familiar with
 the course of recent and present thought in science and metaphysics. As
 meant to confute the Materialism and Atheism of our day, its discussions
 necessarily range along planes of inquiry in which the learning of this gen-
 eration is moving. It is not a book for the uneducated masses, and only
 those who have cultivated their mind in philosophical studies will fully
 appreciate it, or be rightly impressed with the strength and value of its
 well-sustained conclusions. But to these the volume will commend itself
 as a most valuable contribution to a department of truth most vital to hu-
 man welfare.

Its appearance is a sign of healthy reaction against various false meth-
 ods of dealing with the Theistic proof. And the volume will contribute to
 the strength and prevalence of this reaction. It will itself be found, we
 believe, to help very greatly in turning the minds of thinking men to the
 validity and soundness of the methods of which it is an illustration. It is
 a bold and able reassertion of the older theistic proofs, and of their essen-
 tial and abiding conclusiveness. And though by reason of the author’s
 brevity of statement and abruptness of style, it is sometimes not easy to
 grasp fully and clearly his whole meaning and the bearing of the facts
 stated, yet the careful and thoughtful reader will in the end find the argu-
 ment, or combination of arguments to be of great force and convincing
 power.

The occasion of the production of this work was an offered Prize for an
 Essay on the subject, to be competed for by the members of the University
 of Oxford. The characteristics of the work, sought by this competition,
 were taken by Mr. Jackson as a guide in the discussion of the subject, and
 we cannot better state the general idea and scope of the volume than in

the words conditioning the Prize: "For the best Essay in Confutation of
" the Materialism of the present day by arguments derived from Evi-
" dences of Intelligence, Design, Contrivance, and Adaptation of Means
" to Ends, in the Universe, and especially in Man considered in his Moral
" Nature, his Religious Aptitudes, and his Intellectual Powers, and in all
" Organic Nature." That this method of developing theistic proof ac-
corded with the author's already established convictions, is seen in the fact
that in preparing his work, he only expanded a small discourse in which
he had declared his views four years before. It comes before us, therefore,
as a well considered statement of a kind of argument that he regarded as
of high value and calling for present attention.

Probably the best way to give the readers of the REVIEW an idea of the
book and the range of its discussion is to give them, in brief, the contents
of the seven different chapters into which it is divided. The *first* chapter
is introductory, and states various inquiries underlying Natural Theology,
and the way they are answered by our instinctive persuasions, with the
value of the answers. The various phases of doubt are pointed out, and
the method of defence proposed is indicated—the use of diverse proofs of
Theism, mutually supporting each other and becoming consilient at last.

The *second* chapter examines the kind of reasoning involved in the ar-
gument from Design, and inquires into its special force. Some of the
chief objections against this argument are then stated and criticised. Of
these objections some are popular, some scientific. Most of them have
been directed against the form of it as presented in the famous and repre-
sentative treatise of Paley. To the objection, among others, that Paley's
argument from the comparison with a watch is misleading by its
assuming that the structures of nature are formed after the methods of
mechanical arrangement, whereas the processes which form living organ-
isms are wholly unlike those that construct watches, the author gives a
complete answer. The objection alleges that in the assimilation and
growth of animal bodies the processes are all wholly different from the
processes of contriving art, and that the very point on which the compar-
ison is made fails. But it is a sufficient answer, to show that the argument
does not rest upon any *sameness of the processes* by which a watch and
the structures of nature are produced, but upon the single fact of *design*
shown in the product. The process by which the design is accomplished
may be different in the hand of a human contriver from that in the works
of nature, but the structures agree in this, that they, in both cases, evi-
dence design. Mr. Jackson takes up the objection of Prof. Baden Powell,
who distinguishes—and rightly—between Law and Cause, and who criti-
cises Paley's argument as inconclusive because of not recognizing the
Mind instead of objective nature as the source of the idea and law of cau-
sation. Prof. Powell admits the fact of order and arrangement in nature,
but insists that the inference of design and forethought is something *bey-
ond* that fact, and comes from the *mind*; and holds Paley responsible

for *confounding* these two things. In other words, he maintains that we reach a Cause only through the causal action of our own wills, and cannot, therefore, reach it by contemplation of the world without us alone, as he takes Paley as doing. It is a sufficient reply, however, to all this, to say that Paley has not denied this relation of the law of causation to its subjective source—has not discussed the source of it at all, but has simply assumed its validity. In studying physical nature, must nothing be used but physical nature? May we not run up into the conclusion some of the admitted data from the world of mind? Prof. Jackson notes Mr. Powell's inconsistency: "When discussing the question of Evidence, he finds Mind pervading outward Nature—he treats Mind as the ordering and sovereign part of the Natural World, which visibly shows the effect of its invisible direction, and bids us follow up the higher nature in its analogies to God, of whose operation the order and arrangement of the universe are external manifestations. But when he speaks of Natural Theology, that higher nature seems to disappear; intellect, volition, and the power of moral causality, slip out of sight, and are blotted from his catalogues of natural facts. Human nature must thus be treated as no part of universal Nature, in order that a needlessly narrow and purely theoretical fence may be drawn round the science of Natural Theology."

In the *third* chapter, the author draws a "parallel between the difficulties alleged to be fatal against Theism, and the difficulties attaching to very various departments of human knowledge, embracing its most necessary and its most certainly accepted kinds. From this parallel the conclusion becomes evident that whoever accepts one set of truths cannot be debarred by these or similar difficulties from accepting the higher truth likewise." This chapter clearly shows how, in every other department of knowledge and practical life, men treat the kind of objections alleged against Theism as of no validity or force.

The *fourth* chapter inquires into the Beliefs of Reason, or the fundamental human faiths which form first truths to man. The subject is discussed at some length, and the validity of these necessary beliefs is shown to be verified by their practical application.

Under the head of *Production and its Law*, Prof. Jackson presents, in the *fifth* chapter, a special form of teleological proof. "In each productive process of Mankind, we perceive, first, a purpose conceived—the end or final cause—and then a power of force that has to be discovered and fitted to this human purpose. For operative activity, there must be an efficient cause putting in movement the productive law, over and above its apprehension first proposed. This efficient Cause, as always seen in human production, is a Will." The Will, therefore, becomes creative, converting an idea into force running into production of the designed result. "Who shall assert a reign of law in opposition to a reign of Causation, when we perceive that causality is the grand endowment un-

“deriving the highest intelligence in this world, and distinguishing man from every inferior creature? A large class of objections dies in the fact that there is *known* to us a power which can truly originate actions —a clear spring of volitional creativeness.”

The object in the *sixth* chapter—headed *Causation*—is “to distinguish the physical chain of Sequence from Causation properly so termed. In other words, to divide the World, as we see it, into two spheres, the Mechanical and the Personal.” Those who assert, as is so often done, that there is no possibility of passing out of or beyond the chain of secondary and material causes, and legitimately finding a First and Intelligent Cause, should read Prof. Jackson’s argument in this chapter. His statement of the matter is clear and conclusive. He shows how cause in the real sense is found only in Will acting under Reason. In Will is found the difference between things and Persons, and so a true cause must, without exception, be also a true Personality. “Look at the subject in whatever point of view we will,—as an abstract question—as a calculable problem—or an affair of plain common sense,—the result must finally come to one and the same thing. There can be no Cause,—no First to stand before (not in) the series of sequences, except a Being, Will, Personality.”

The *seventh* chapter shows how the great fact of *Responsibility* becomes an impregnable proof of the being of God. It is shown that “the universally enforced maxim of Responsibility unites in itself two factors, *first*, a true power of Causation, as explained in Chap. VI., and *second*, a moral distinction of Right and Wrong.” * * * “From the connection of Morality with Causation, it may be inferred that the Moral Law has its ultimate existence in a Supreme Personality—a just and sovereign God. This conclusion is verified. Human life and human death read as the same lesson.”

To the various chapters numerous and explanatory and illustrative Notes are added, giving, from a very large number of authors, well-chosen and valuable quotations on the different facts and points brought into discussion. Altogether the work forms a very valuable addition to the literature of Natural Theology.

The following extract gives the author’s view of the possibility of miracles, and the philosophy of the proof of the existence of God in the fact of revelation:

“Our business has lain with the Natural world, human nature itself included. And in examining the successional chain, we have perceived that it is not forged of Adamant. Yet there is so much connection and unity running throughout it, that we may with the greatest justice speak of the *order* and *course* of nature. And, perhaps the *highest* kind of evidence to the being and attributes of God conceivable by us, lies in the concurrence of *two* separate kinds of proof; both resting on the reality of Divine *causation* viewed *relatively* to the World we in-

"habit. The one,—when we trace (as in this Chapter we have shown that men ought to trace), the chain of natural sequence up to a Personal First Cause. The other,—when we find occasion to believe that the First Cause and Creator of the world, has seen fit to interfere with his orderly course in a manner which distinguishes His intervention from our common every-day experience.

"For such intervention, we could probably conceive no greater fitness, no nobler occasion, than the purpose of raising Men above themselves, and assuring them that there are more things in Heaven and Earth than are dreamed of in their Philosophies. And what human dream, vision, or philosophy, could ever have foreseen the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him?"

SMITH, ENGLISH & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

Text Book of Church History. By John Henry Kurtz, Professor of Theology in the University of Dorpat: author of a "Manual of Sacred History," "The Bible and Astronomy," etc., etc. Two volumes in One. Revised, with Corrections and Additions from the Seventh German Edition. Vol. I. To the Reformation, pp. 534. Vol. II., From the Reformation, Vol. II., pp. 470. 1875.

This admirable Compend of Church History is now published by Smith, English & Co. It is too well known, and has been too largely used in Theological Seminaries and by ministers to need a special criticism. This new edition, professedly revised with corrections and additions from the Seventh German edition, requires a brief notice to guard against misapprehension. Who the reviser is we are not informed, but from internal evidence take him to be a Baptist, who has seen to corrections about his own Church, but has not been equally careful in regard to some others. In a brief Preface, he explains that the corrections have only been partial. The statements in regard to the Lutheran Church in the United States, vol. II. 350, are so incorrect and unfair as to make them worse than worthless. The seventh German edition comes down to 1874, and yet the author allows statements to stand that were considered little better than a caricature fifteen years ago, and which are now repeated with some additions which do not improve the case. It is scarcely credible and certainly not creditable, that a writer of Dr. Kurtz' reputation, and a Lutheran, should manifest such gross ignorance of the Lutheran Church in this country. In the year 1874 he represents the General Synod as having 350 ministers, etc.—a number scarcely representing the actual strength 30 years ago—and Dr. S. S. Schmucker as still representing in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg "the tendency hitherto prevailing"—not knowing that Dr. Schmucker had retired from the Seminary ten years before, and had gone to his rest. He also speaks of Drs. Krauth and Schaeffer as if they were still serving in the Seminary. We do not know what Dr. Kurtz' means of obtaining information may be, but we know

that such ignorance and error perpetuated in a popular text book by a Lutheran, are inexcusable. We suggest to Smith, English & Co. to have suitable corrections made in any subsequent issue of the work,

NELSON & PHILLIPS, NEW YORK.

The Living Wesley, as he was in his Youth and in his Prime. By James H. Rigg, D. D., Principal of the Wesleyan Training College, Westminster, England, Author of "Modern Anglican Theology," "The Relations of John Wesley and of Wesleyan Methodism with the Church of England," "Essays for the Times," etc. With an Introduction by John F. Hurst, D. D. 1875. pp. 269.

Dr. Hurst, whose Introduction gives a brief account of the character, position and writings of the author, commends this volume as giving "information which cannot be found elsewhere, or rather, judgments founded upon data with which the previous authors had no acquaintance." Dr. Rigg's object has been, to present a picture of Wesley, relieved of some features which imperfect information and misapprehension had connected with his character. After giving a pretty full and critical account of the literature of the subject, he furnishes statements of various points of interest in Wesley's earlier life, and then of the chief features of his mature life and ministry, concerning which he believes, erroneous views have been held. It is a very interesting and valuable volume to those who desire to know the truth in connection with one of the greatest names in the Church's modern history. It is somewhat strange, however, that Dr. Rigg should commit the error of saying: "No Protestant Church at this day counts so many adherents as the Methodist family of Churches." He should revise his statistics.

Our King and Saviour; or the Story of our Lord's Life on Earth. In which its great Events are arranged in their probable Chronological Order, and so set forth as to make their Reality and Meaning clear to the understanding and attractive the imagination and hearts of Young Persons and general readers. By Daniel Wise, D. D. With eighty-three illustrations. pp. 367.

Though less ambitious than most of the recent attempts to form, from our four Gospels, a connected view of the life of Christ, this volume has features which commend it to the public. It is "not intended for critics and biblical scholars, but for senior Sunday scholars, Sunday teachers, and general readers. Its events are given in the order of Dr. Strong's 'Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels.'" Its statements are brief and clear, in a popular and attractive style. Without endorsing every interpretation it presents, we believe the book will help the readers for whom it is intended to a clearer understanding of the wondrous life of Jesus.

Spiritual Struggles of a Roman Catholic: An Autobiographical Sketch.

By Louis N. Beaudry, author of "Army and Prison Experience with the Fifth New York Cavalry," With an Introduction by Rev. B. Hawley, D. D. pp. 275. 1875.

In the present questions growing out of the relations of Romanism to the civil authority and the common schools of our country, such volumes as this are specially valuable. Mr. Beaudry, having been brought up in the Roman Catholic Church, is able to present its teachings and practice from an inside view. In giving a view of Romanism, in connection with this account of his spiritual struggles as he was compelled in conscience to become a Protestant, his spirit is charmingly loving and gentle, and void of bitterness or denunciation. It is written in the right spirit, and will do good.

Holiness the Birthright of all God's Children. By Rev. J. T. Crane, D. D., of the Newark Conference, author of the "Right Way," "Popular Amusements," "Arts of Intoxication," etc. Second Edition, Enlarged. 1875. pp. 211.

This is a work on Sanctification, and is written with clearness and force. The author maintains that Christian perfection has in it three elements: "1. Freedom from voluntary transgression of known law; 2. Freedom from the moral depravity which inheres in the soul previous to renewal; 3. The Development and maturity of the Christian graces." The destruction of depravity, which he regards as fully accomplished by regeneration, is not to be understood as consequent freedom from error, infirmity, temptation, &c. These he does not count as moral depravity, nor the remains of depravity, but as simple elements of our probationary life. From the doctrine taught on this second point, many will dissent; but the volume is a stirring appeal for Christian holiness, and worthy of wide circulation.

All for Christ; or How the Christian may obtain, by a renewed Consecration of the heart, the fullness of joy referred to by the Saviour just previous to His crucifixion. With Illustrations from the lives of those who have made this Consecration. By Rev. Thomas Carter, D. D., author of "History of the Great Reformation in England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany," etc. 1875. pp. 192.

This is another presentation of the doctrine of Christian perfection, as held by many in the Methodist Church. Without agreeing with the specific doctrine with which this plea for holiness is urged, we commend to all believers its earnest appeal for the right consecration of life, time, thought, words, money, &c., to Christ. It is a call for right living.

Binney's Theological Compend, containing a Synopsis of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals, and Institutions of Christianity. Designed for Bible

Classes, Theological students, and young Preachers. By Rev. Amos Binney, and Rev. Daniel Steele, D. D. 1875. pp. 195.

This is a new and improved edition of a work that has been long and favorably known. Very few manuals of this sort have enjoyed such extensive favor, or been so widely used. Of the work in the form before this revision, at least thirty-five thousand copies were printed in English, besides translations in German, Swedish, Arabic, Chinese, and other languages. In the form now issued, the author has recast and enriched the volume, fortifying its statements by more abundant Scripture references, and adapting it to meet the later methods of assault on Christian truth. Its doctrinal statements are brief, and marked by great clearness of thought and expression. Of course, in a work of this kind, all the different points of controversial theology are traversed. The author has necessarily looked at them from his own standpoint, but his presentation of Christian truth will find a very general acceptance. It is thoroughly Evangelical, and as a book of reference it will be, as it has been, found to be convenient for those for whom it has been prepared, and will serve the cause of Christian truth and piety.

Outline of Church History. By John of Hurst. pp. 98.

This is one of the Normal Outline Series and falls within the Sunday School Department. To a good teacher, such an outline, as the framework for the entire structure of Church history, affords one of the very best means of success in historical instruction. Dr. Hurst has produced a manual admirably suited to its purpose. It is well printed, with different kinds of type to mark the various divisions, topics, &c., to help the memory, and with excellent maps.

The preparation of Outlines of Church History for Normal Classes in the Sunday School, of course assumes that this kind of study is appropriate and useful in that relation. Those who understand the matter best, we think, will concur in this judgment. A thorough acquaintance with the history of the Church, in the Providences through which it has passed, and the experiences that have marked its work and progress, must be of great service to the Sunday School teacher.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHER, NEW YORK.

For sale by Smith, English & Co., Phila.,

Little Brothers and Sisters. By Emma Marshall, author of the Primrose Series," "Between the Cliffs," etc. 1875. pp. 375.

Mable Walton's Experiment. By Joanna H. Mathews, author of "The Bessie Books," etc. 1875. pp. 347.

These two neat volumes are from the pen of authors who have been very successful in writing interesting and instructive books for the young.

Their stories are so full of Christian truth, and breathe so much of the spirit of piety, that they can hardly fail to make their little readers wiser and better. We think the books for the young are running too much in the line of stories; but if instruction is to be conveyed in this pleasant way we wish to commend those marked by this pure and healthful tone.

THE FOREIGN QUARTERLIES AND BLACKWOOD.

The Four great Quarterlies for July have been received—also Blackwood for July, August, and September.

In the *Edinburg Review*, among other interesting articles, are "Life and Works of Thorvaldsden," "The Education of the Children of the State," and "The Physiological Influence of Alcohol."

In the *London Quarterly*, "The first Stewart in England," "Balloons and Voyages in the Air," "Tennyson's Queen Mary," &c.

In the *Westminster Review*, "Sunday and Lent," from a skeptical stand point, "Allotropic Christianity," "The Evidences of Design in Nature."

In the *British Quarterly Review*, Shakespeare's Character and early Career," "The Future of the English Universities," "Sin and Madness from a Physician's Point of View," "Church and State in India," "Mr. Disraeli as Minister," "Edgar Allan Poe."

Blackwood brings its regular supplies of excellent reading. An article of special value is found in the July No., on "Modern Skepticism and its Fruit."

CONTENTS OF NO. IV.

Article.	Page.
<p>I. THE RELATION AND DUTIES OF EDUCATORS TO CRIME, 481 J. B. BITTINGER, D. D., Sewickley, Pa.</p>	481
<p>II. THE LORD'S SUPPER,..... By Rev. G. DIEHL, D. D.</p>	489
<p>III. CONSECRATION IN THE MINISTRY,..... By Rev. D. STECK, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.</p>	523
<p>IV. WHAT IS A FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINE,..... Translated from the German by Rev. H. E. JACOBS, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.</p>	535
<p>V. ERASMUS AND LUTHER,..... By Rev. B. SADTLER, D. D., Lutherville, Md.</p>	547
<p>VI. HEBREWS 13 : 10,</p>	564
<p>VII. COLLEGIATE EDUCATION,..... By Rev. J. B. HELWIG, M. A., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.</p>	569
<p>VIII. GENERAL SYNOD,.....</p>	591
<p>IX. THE WORK OF THE REVIEW,.....</p>	604
<p>X. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,.....</p>	612
<p>XI. NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS,.....</p>	616

AMERICAN.

Biblical and Theological—Philosophical and Scientific—Historical and Biographical—Travels, &c.—Poetry—Miscellaneous.

BRITISH.

History—Literary—Miscellaneous.

GERMAN.

Biblical—Systematic Theology—Historical—Biographical.

NEW BOOKS.

Justification by Faith, as held and taught by Lutherans—The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version—The Service of Praise—The Theistic Conception of the World—The Character and Logical Method of Political Economy—The Early Kings of Norway, Also an Essay on the Portraits of John Knox—The Philosophy of Natural Theology—Text Book of Church History—The Living Wesley—Our King and Saviour—Spiritual Struggles of a Roman Catholic—Holiness the Birthright of all God's Children—All for Christ—Binney's Theological Compend—Outline of Church History—Little Brothers and Sisters—Mable Walton's Experiment.

